

# BOSTON REVIEW.

VOL. VI.—JULY, 1866.—No. 33.

---

## ARTICLE I.

FREDERICK WILLIAM ROBERTSON.

*Sermons*, preached at Trinity Chapel, Brighton, by the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A., the Incumbent. Five Series. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1857—1864.

*Lectures and Addresses on Literary and Social Topics*, by the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A., of Brighton. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1859.

*Life and Letters* of FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847—53. Edited by STOPFORD A. BROOKE, M. A., late Chaplain to the Embassy at Berlin. In two volumes. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1865.

FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON was born in London, 3d February, 1816, and died in Brighton 15th August, 1853. Though in the ministry thirteen years, he was actively engaged hardly more than eleven, one at Winchester, four at Cheltenham, and six at Brighton. At the former places, he wrote his sermons; at the last, he preached from brief but carefully prepared notes. In his day, he was not more widely known than many of his profession whose works will never be published, and whose biographies will never be written. Since his death, his name has become familiar to the reading public, in his own country and in this. His published sermons consist partly of abstracts and complete discourses written by himself after their delivery,

but mainly of fragments gathered from his own and the notes of some who heard him; and yet, as they have been issued a volume at a time, and at intervals sufficient to ensure the safety of continuing the enterprise, they have been warmly praised and widely circulated. Though preached by a professed Trinitarian in the church of England, and published in America in the interest of so-called liberal Christianity, they are yet commended by Orthodox journals, sometimes without a word of censure or of caution, and are consequently purchased and read by many who desire to nourish their piety on the vital truths of the Gospel. They are said to be the favorite reading of many of the younger portion of the Orthodox clergy of New England, who have awaited with interest every succeeding volume, and who are doubtless impatient at the delay of the promised "Pulpit Notes." The appearance of his "Life and Letters" has furnished his admiring critics with a new occasion to commend his works to the people, as of surpassing interest and excellence, and to the ministry, as a means of improving their theology and their preaching. In the absence of knowledge on the subject, it might be inferred from these facts, either that the Latitudinarians are leaning to orthodoxy, or that the Orthodox are leaning to latitudinarianism. There is, however, too much evidence that the former is not the true inference. Is the latter the true one? It may be charitably supposed, that ordinary readers may be deceived through the lack of ability to discriminate between the genuine and the specious, in the works of a sophistical author. But must charity be taxed thus in behalf of professional theologians and public teachers? That the highest praise of these works should have emanated from those whose chief or only interest in evangelical religion is to disparage its professors and undermine its principles, starts the suspicion that they may offer false explanations and specious substitutes rather than clearer and more scriptural exhibitions of the truth; for the offence of the cross has not yet ceased. A few of the Orthodox have indeed expressed their dissent from the author's views; but as they have generally chosen to express it very indefinitely, and to dwell more at length upon certain excellences which will be gener-

ally acknowledged, there is certainly occasion for the more unwelcome task of exhibiting his defects.

Since the author is commended as an oracle and a model, it is a little surprising that none of the sermons of the former half of his ministry have been deemed worthy a place in this collection. If a genius indeed, some of his earlier discourses should have been at least equal to any of his later. According to Mr. Brooke, however, the sermons of the first year are weak and "startlingly inferior," and "do not, to the reader, even foretell his future excellence." This judgment might be accepted without question, were it based on the fact, stated by a constant hearer, that they were written "always on Saturday, the time between breakfast and one o'clock sufficing for a sermon." But the secret of their "inferiority" appears to lie rather in the fact that "they contain all the characteristic doctrines against which he afterwards so deliberately protested at Brighton." On this account they might be preferred by many to those which have been published. But whatever the merit of these, some of those preached during the next four years must have been, in style at least, equal to the fragments contained in these volumes. They are pronounced better than his former efforts, in being more carefully wrought, of a different character in sentiment, and "no longer so much disquisitions on doctrine or impassioned descriptions of the love of God in Christ." But we are told that even "at this time his ideal was not very high." The altered character of his sermons were a sufficient reason for not giving them to the public; yet, unhappily, a greater change in the same direction led to the publication of these series. That change was gradual but rapid, and amounted to a complete revolution in his views of the doctrines of the Bible. What he once preached, he afterwards scorned. At the beginning of his ministry he made a "full and forcible declaration of Evangelical views." After a few weeks at Cheltenham it was a question whether he was "a Tractarian" or "an ultra Calvinist"; and within two years he wrote, "The Tractarians despise me, and the Evangelicals somewhat loudly express their doubts of me." In two years more "it became painful to him to preach." Though nominally "of the Evangelical school," he was growing in hostility against it. And by the time he went

to Brighton he felt clear and decided, "that the system on which he had founded his whole faith and work could never be received by him again." This was a discovery, and laid him under great obligation. If the current theology of the Evangelicals was so unsound, it belonged to him to lead a reformation. Could he do this, he would lay the world and the church under great obligation to him.

Whether this revolution was for the better, depends not upon the judgment of those who sympathize either with the views adopted or with the views renounced, but upon the simple fact of a nearer approach to, or a further departure from the word of God. This is the furnace in which the gold is purified from the dross. "If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." To this test it is proposed to subject the views of this author upon some of the prominent doctrines of the Christian system.

Mr. Robertson "projected once a work on Inspiration," but deferred it, saying, "The English mind is not prepared yet." But he has left some hints of what he intended to elaborate. He believed in the inspiration of the Bible, but his views differ materially from those commonly received. "I hold it to be inspired, not dictated. It is the word of God; the words of man: as the former, perfect; as the latter, imperfect."<sup>1</sup> One who claimed to be so familiar with the New Testament that the proof-texts of a doctrine arrayed themselves spontaneously before his mind, should have remembered a few which represent inspiration as itself dictation. "I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." Rev. xiv. 13. If the Apostle may be believed, he wrote the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse from dictation, in distinction from every other phase of inspiration. Nor is it any more incredible that the Holy Spirit should at his pleasure have articulated his revelation to man's hearing and in man's language, than that Jesus converted the water into wine at the marriage in Cana.

"The prophetic power, in which I suppose is chiefly exhibited

<sup>1</sup>*Life and Letters*, ii. 14.



that which we mean by inspiration, depends almost entirely on moral greatness. The prophet discerned large principles, true for all time, chiefly by largeness of heart and sympathy of spirit with God's spirit. This is my conception of inspiration."<sup>1</sup> It would be interesting to see by what ingenuity he could show the application of this principle to Balaam, in the prophecy: "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel."

"The difference between Moses and Anaxagoras, the Epistles and the 'Excursion,' I believe is in degree. The light or the Word which dwells in all men, dwells in loftier degree in some than in others, and also is of a nobler kind of inspiration. Bezaleel and Aholiab, artificers, were men inspired, we are told. Why they more than other seers of the beautiful? . . . One department is higher than another; in each department, too, the degree of knowledge may vary from a glimmering glimpse to infallibility: so that all is properly inspiration, but immensely differing in value and in degree. . . . I think this view of the matter is important, because in the other way some twenty or thirty men in the world's history have had a special communication, miraculous, and from God. In this, all have it, and by devout and earnest cultivation of the mind and heart may have it increased illimitably."<sup>2</sup>

In one sentence he seems to distinguish between "degree" and "kind," but the distinction obviously means not different kinds of inspiration, but different degrees of it in different kinds or departments of knowledge. No distinction of natural and supernatural is admitted. The idea of supernatural inspiration is distinctly repudiated. It is all asserted to be natural, susceptible of cultivation and of illimitable increase. In respect of the kind of inspiration, a heathen philosopher is put upon a level with the writer of the Pentateuch, and Wordsworth upon a level with the Apostles. What arrogance in Paul, then, to declare to the Galatians: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. . . . For I neither received it from man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Notwithstanding the "moral greatness," and "largeness of heart and sympathy of spirit, with God's spirit,"

<sup>1</sup> Life and Letters, II. 144, 145.

<sup>2</sup> Life and Letters, I. 270, 271.

with which this theory of natural and universal inspiration is put forth, it is utterly refuted by the testimony of Peter that, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"; and by the testimony of Paul that, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." For plainly Paul meant to distinguish the Bible from all other books, and Peter meant to distinguish the writers of the Bible from all other men, by the peculiarity of a supernatural and divine inspiration.

"The Jews were confessedly the most spiritual of mankind. So vast is the interval between them and all others, that the collected works which, in speaking of another people, would be called a national literature, are of them called an inspired Bible."<sup>1</sup> The Targums and Apocrypha and all other writings of the Jews, however much at variance with the books commonly known as the Old Testament, equally inspired with these; and the possibility of these sermons and letters, had the author only been born a Jew, being worthy to be ranked with the writings of Moses and the prophets!

The author is manifestly not only unscriptural, but very superficial. He could not understand how the sacred writers could have been supernaturally inspired without thereby being made mere machines. To be consistent he should have represented Christ as a mere machine, so far as he was human. But if Jesus Christ was entirely at his freedom in respect of his human nature notwithstanding the indwelling of his Divine nature, so that the words which he spake were spirit and life, and absolutely identical with and perfect as the word of God, why may not the writers of the Bible, in an analogous manner, have been as personally free in thinking and speaking and writing that which was at the same time inspired within them by the Holy Spirit both in thought and expression, so that their words were perfect as, and identical with the word of God? With such a plenary inspiration, the writers preserved their freedom in the exercise of their powers and in the exhibition of their respective peculiarities, while the record, as it came from their hands, was the infallible word of God. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the American as well as "the English mind is not prepared yet" to

<sup>1</sup> Fourth Series, 239.

believe that Mr. Robertson, on the subject of inspiration at least, spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost.

He is not less at variance with the obvious import of the Scriptures in regard to the doctrine of sin.

"The Fall was only a necessary consequence of a state of mere nature. It was a step downwards from innocence, but also it was a step onwards; a giant step in human progress. It made goodness possible; for to know the evil, and to conquer it and choose the good, is far nobler than a state which only consists in our ignorance of both. Until the step of nature has been passed, the step of spirituality can not be made. 'That was not first which was spiritual, but that which was natural.'"<sup>1</sup> "It is a law of our humanity, that man must know both good and evil; he must know good *through* evil."<sup>2</sup> "Fallen man is not a watch with something wrong added (sin), but merely a watch without the regulator."<sup>3</sup>

These sentiments are not new, nor peculiar to Mr. Robertson. They are nearly as old as the human race, having been first propounded in the garden of Eden. The coincidence is remarkable. How easy and natural it is for a man who denies the supernatural and special inspiration of the Scriptures, and sets his own reason above revelation, to overlook the facts of experience and observation, and to take the side of the Tempter! The consequence? All the wickedness and woe that Robertson had seen were but an infinitesimal part of it. It was the Fall; and yet, according to him and the serpent, a blessing, "a giant step in human progress," "a nobler state" than the primitive. On this theory, God, being the author of the "state of nature," is responsible for "the necessary consequence," the Fall, and ought neither to have cursed the tempter nor to have been displeased with the tempted. Christ, also, not having disobeyed the Father, remained in the state of nature, a stranger to that of spirituality, because ignorant of good and evil! The Fall being necessary to make goodness possible, it is very strange that the first-born killed his brother, and that the whole race, one family excepted, provoked God to destroy

<sup>1</sup> Fourth Series, 241.

<sup>2</sup> Lectures and Addresses, 90.

<sup>3</sup> Life and Letters, i. 276.

them, and that the great majority of Noah's posterity have not been saints instead of heathen. If the statement, that "It is a law of our humanity, that man must know both good and evil," has any truth, it is in respect of humanity as fallen and not as unfallen. God did not inaugurate his moral government by issuing a command in contravention to the law of humanity by which he had constituted his subjects responsible beings. Robertson himself says that, "The will which has shaken itself free from God's will is the central principle of sin." And the Apostle declares that "By one man sin entered into the world." According to the inspired word, therefore, the Fall was sin; the first sin of the human race. To give his statements plausibility, the author quoted a passage in which the Apostle asserts the natural mortality of our present bodies as the condition to spiritual bodies in the resurrection, and which therefore has no relevancy and constitutes no proof.<sup>1</sup> But this is only one of the many instances of his daring and reckless wresting of the Scriptures.

"It is plain that the first man must have exerted on his race an influence quite peculiar, that his acts must have biassed their acts. And this bias or tendency is what we call original sin."<sup>2</sup> "The most degrading thing in the heart of man is the disbelief in the goodness of human nature."<sup>3</sup> The former of these statements was introduced by reference to "the very hound" and to "the horse of Spain" as illustrations of "all experience in the transmission of qualities": it is therefore a little ludicrous that a man, "acutely conscious of small errors" in writing, should find in our hereditary bias "an influence quite peculiar." As to the latter, it is a fact of universal observation, that as a general rule those who disbelieve in the goodness of human nature are neither more degraded nor so degraded as those who believe in it. Paul declares to the Romans that, "The carnal mind is enmity against God"; and to the Ephesians, in reference to their previous and unrenewed state, that, "We all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others."

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Letters*, I. 303.<sup>2</sup> *Second Series*, 85, 86.<sup>3</sup> *Fifth Series*, 75.

As to the method of the development of this bias, he says : "Generally there is first a rising of an inclination which is often no sin. This passes on to a guilty resolve ; one step more, and the man has committed the sin."<sup>1</sup> And the possibility of the bias remaining undeveloped is to be inferred from the remarkable fact that, in Trinity Chapel, at a confirmation, "Six or seven hundred young persons solemnly pledged themselves to renounce evil in themselves and in the world, . . . as yet untainted by open sin."<sup>2</sup> But how can there be a sinless "inclination" to sin, or a guiltless "guilty resolve" to sin? And how can persons "renounce evil in themselves and in the world," while as yet they are "untainted by open sin"? The "one step more," or the outward act, was not necessary to constitute sin in the view of him who said, "That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." In regard to the penalty of sin, he tells us that,

"When man fell, . . . death, which must ever have existed as a form of dissolution,—a passing from one state to another, became a curse ; the sting of death was sin ; unchanged in itself, it changed in man."<sup>3</sup> "The sin which led to suicide led to hell ; but it was his own place, in the way of natural retribution, not of arbitrary reprobation."<sup>4</sup> "Hell is the infinite terror of the soul, whatever that may be. To one man it is pain . . . To another it is public shame . . . To others . . . infinite, maddening remorse."<sup>5</sup> "Hell is not merely a thing hereafter, hell is a thing here ; hell is not a thing banished to a distance, it is ubiquitous as conscience."<sup>6</sup>

That man as originally created was essentially mortal, is an assumption which no philosophy can prove ; the mortality of fallen man is rather against it than for it. But that the sting of death were sin, without the Fall, would that Robertson, in his "largeness of heart and sympathy of spirit with God's spirit," had condescended to explain ! The death of the body is implied as a part of the penalty denounced against the first transgression. And Paul says expressly, in regard to the mortality of the

<sup>1</sup> Fifth Series, 71.

<sup>2</sup> First Series, 39, 40.

<sup>3</sup> Third Series, 183.

<sup>4</sup> Life and Letters, i. 167.

<sup>5</sup> First Series, 148, 149.

<sup>6</sup> Fifth Series, 180.

body, that, "In Adam all die." Against the assertion that punishment is simply the natural reaction of an outraged conscience, our Saviour teaches us that there is an "outer darkness." He pronounced a peculiar "wo" against Judas; and taught us to "fear," not conscience, not any mere natural retribution, but "him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." And Paul declares that God will render to the incorrigibly wicked, "indignation and wrath."

Of course such a man found it very difficult to conform his practice in preaching to his theory in doctrine. Notwithstanding the frequency and violence of his denunciation of the cant and vulgarities of the Evangelicals, he was often guilty of even worse cant and vulgarity himself. In a literary lecture, he could not remark upon Hood's "Bridge of Sighs" without adding the taunt that, "The disciple of some school of cold divinity would see in it only a text for a discourse on hell." Even while preaching on "the terrors of the judgment," and insisting that "these are things which will be hereafter," he must take the terror from "the terrors" by an expression of pious horror at the hypocrisy of "God's ministers" who "paint the torments of the lost minutely and hideously, and can yet go home to the evening meal with zest unimpaired." Certainly in him, if not in the race, not only was "the regulator" wanting, but there must have been "something wrong added." Not only "the mainspring run the chain out too fast," but the hands were never right except by accident; when in their mad revolutions they swept the point of true time upon the dial.

With such views of sin, he would happily disappoint the discriminating reader by a scriptural exhibition of the doctrine of the Atonement. To the question, "If God is Love, why do we need a mediator?" he replies:

"I do not know. Nor do I know why, God being Love, . . . suffering is the necessary medium of anything that really deserves the name of blessing . . . I only know that it is so . . . And seeing that as the law of the universe, I am prepared to believe and acquiesce in it when found in the Atonement, as a part of the divine government,—a philosophically as well as theologically demanded necessity."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Letters*, i. 306.

He does not know that while John says "God is love," another apostle says, "God is a consuming fire"! He does not know that God is just, and therefore can not forgive sin except by a righteous ransom for the sinner! He does not know that we need a mediator because God is love; hating sin just in proportion as he loves holiness! Nor does he seem to leave any room for the sovereign exercise of compassionate love in God in giving his Son to die for us, but holds the Sovereign of the universe to a so-called law of the universe. This is sufficiently "cold divinity."

Again he says: "The evangelical 'scheme' of reconciling justice with mercy I consider the poorest effort ever made by false metaphysics. They simply misquote a text. That he might be just (and yet) the justifier. Whereas St. Paul says, the just and the justifier: i.e., just, because the justifier."<sup>1</sup> It is enough to say of this construction, that it can not by any exegetical torture be drawn from the Apostle's language, and is equivalent to a declaration that God would have been unjust had he declined to show mercy.

Moreover, he holds that Christ's sacrifice was voluntary and vicarious, notwithstanding it was a philosophically demanded necessity. "Christ came into collision with the world's evil, and he bore the penalty of that daring. . . . The Redeemer bore imputed sin. He bore the penalty of others' sin. He was punished."<sup>2</sup> To understand this, it is necessary to understand his use of the word penalty. In the sermon from which these sentences are quoted, he says:

"By punishment is simply meant the penalty annexed to transgression of a law. Punishment is of two kinds; the penalty which follows ignorant transgression, and the chastisement which ensues upon wilful disobedience. The first of these is called imputed guilt, the second is actual guilt. By imputed guilt is meant, in theological language, that a person is treated as if he were guilty. If, for example, you approach too near the whirling wheel of steam machinery, the mutilation which follows is the punishment of temerity."

Imputed guilt, then, is worse than actual guilt, ignorant

<sup>1</sup> Life and Letters, 11. 56.

<sup>2</sup> First Series, 175, 176.



transgression being punished while wilful disobedience is only chastised ! In the Scriptures, punishment is said to be inflicted upon the wilfully disobedient, and chastisement upon those who have been justified from sin. Besides, chastisement is inflicted only in this life, while punishment is mainly reserved for the period beyond this life. And the object of Christ's sufferings and death was not to prevent chastisement, but to "destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil ; and deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." But according to the author, it was not the imputed sin of wilful disobedience, not imputed actual guilt, but the imputed sin of ignorant transgression, imputed "imputed guilt," that the Redeemer bore for sinners. And this imputed guilt is somehow not the actual guilt of others, but Christ's own ; for he transgressed a law, a law of the universe, and transgressed it ignorantly, and thus incurred imputed guilt. "Christ came into collision with the world's evil, and he bore the penalty of that daring. He approached the whirling wheel, and was torn in pieces." And this was vicarious sacrifice ! This sermon is not a bad specimen of the author's boasted suggestiveness. It is a good example of his style of reasoning. The distinction between natural laws and the moral law is overlooked. He is arbitrary and incorrect in his definitions, and inconsistent in his use of them. His sequences are illogical, and his notions of the subject confused. He had no clear conception of the problem he was trying to solve. The further he pursues it, the worse he makes it. He declares the death of Christ something more than the world's example, and yet reduces it to that in his statements of its result. "His death is the world's life. Ask ye what life is ? Life is not exemption from penalty. Salvation is not escape from suffering and punishment." In opposition to this, many passages might be cited from the word of God, but one or two will suffice. Paul says to the Hebrews : "If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward ; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation ?" And a greater than Paul says : "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved ; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

Robertson seems to have grasped with great firmness so much of the doctrine as pertains to the surrender of self-will, but to have failed altogether to apprehend that further element which alone demonstrated the reality of this surrender.

"What in that atonement was the element that satisfied God? They say pain. I say, because I think the Scriptures say so, the surrender of self-will, as is clearly and distinctly asserted in John x. 17: and also in Hebrews x. 5, 6, 7, 10, where the distinction is drawn between the sacrifices of blood and suffering, which were mere butchery, and the sacrifice which atones, in this special point, that one is moral, an act of 'WILL,'—the other un-moral, merely physical, and therefore worthless."<sup>1</sup>

His proof texts are unfortunate. The citation from John implies indeed the surrender of self-will, but expressly declares the surrender of life: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again." So in the citation from Hebrews, while the surrender of self-will is declared, the entire efficacy of this surrender of self-will is conditioned upon actual sufferings and death. This is plain, the moment we read the passages, supplying what is understood, and putting the stress where the Apostle obviously put it. "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering" of the blood of bulls and goats "thou wouldst not, but a *body* hast thou prepared *me*: in burnt offerings and sacrifices" by the Jewish priesthood "for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. By the which will we are sanctified *through the offering of the body* of Jesus Christ once for all." Besides, the "will," in this last passage, is evidently the will of the Father as accomplished by the Son's offering of his body. But when was Christ's surrender of self-will made? Was it not made in the agony in which he said: "O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done"? But the atonement was not then made; it was made only when his death upon the cross was accomplished. And the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, instead of being Robertson's view, is that the

<sup>1</sup>Life and Letters, II. 138.

essence of the atonement consists in the sufferings and death, the blood, of Christ.<sup>1</sup> It is decidedly brazen to set aside this as "a vulgar notion of the atonement."

Preaching upon 2 Corinthians v. 18, 21, he declares that "reconciliation is identical with atonement." He founds the statement on Romans v. 11, in which the word usually rendered "reconciliation," is for once rendered "atonement," and means, as is perfectly plain from the context, not atonement as made for the unreconciled, but reconciliation as an accomplished fact in the experience of Paul the believer. Yet he expounds: "Here, therefore, you might read: 'Who hath atoned us to himself by Jesus Christ.' We can not repeat this too often. The 'atonement' of the Bible is the reconciliation between God and man."<sup>2</sup> Let it, then, be repeated throughout his text:

"Who hath *atoned* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of *atonement*; to wit, that God was in Christ, *atoning* the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of *atonement*. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye *atoned* to God."

The repetition demonstrates the absurdity. But he declares that "the atonement is made when God no longer reckons the sinner guilty." According to this, either God no longer reckons any sinner guilty, or else the atonement has not been made for sinners who are yet unforgiven; but was made yesterday for those who yesterday became reconciled to God, and is made to-day for those who repent and receive pardon to-day. This last would seem to be his view, as his biographer says that he held that "the sacrifice of Christ is forever going on." Though Christ cried with a loud voice, "It is finished," and expired with the echo of his cry, we are called upon to believe that the atonement is not finished for any man till he has received justification. Mr. Brooke calls his theory "partly original." If the views above quoted represent the original part of his theory, it is to be hoped that no one will desire to

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ii. 9, 10, 14: vii. 27: viii. 3: ix. 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22: x. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Fourth Series, 340.

rob him of his originality. His scornful remark respecting the evangelical scheme is at least one degree more pertinent respecting his own: "the poorest effort ever made by false metaphysics."

The author thus states his position in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity:

"We believe that in that unity of Essence there are three living Powers which we call Persons, distinct from each other. It is in virtue of His own incommunicable Essence that God is the Father. It is the human side of His nature by which he is revealed as the Son. We believe that from all eternity there was that in the mind of God which I have called its human side, which made it possible for Him to be imaged in humanity; and that again named the Spirit, by which He could mix and mingle Himself with us."<sup>1</sup>

The incommunicable essence is therefore communicable; for "every holy aspiration, every thought and act, that has been on the side of right against wrong, is a part of his holy essence, of his Spirit in us." These three Persons are not Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in relation to each other; but the first is Father as "Creator," the second is a "Son, as manifested in humanity, chiefly in Christ," and the third is "God within us mingling with our being." In other words, the Creator is the Father, mankind are the Son, and all that is morally good in mankind is the Holy Spirit; "diverse parts of his complex being, just as our reason, our memory, our imagination, are not the same, but really ourselves." This is put forth, as the connection shows, as his understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity as held by the church of England. This representation, of course, would not be owned by that church. It does not accord with her creed, nor with her standard authors on the subject, nor with the Scriptures. It does not recognize the distinction of persons, as immanent in the Godhead, and independent of the creation of man and of the universe. It does not recognize them as persons in necessary and reciprocal relations, but represents them as diverse Powers of one Essence. It makes God Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, simply because of the creation of man. That such is his meaning, quotations from other portions of his works abundantly prove. "Christ

<sup>1</sup> Fifth Series, 89, 90.

came to reveal a Name; the Father. He abolished the exclusive 'my,' and he taught to pray 'our Father.' He proclaimed God the Father, man the Son: revealed that the Son of Man is also the Son of God. Man, as man, God's child."<sup>1</sup>

The Fatherhood of God is thus made universal, simply by virtue of the creation of man. But the name of God as a father in this sense was revealed before Christ came. Malachi says: "Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?" And Christ says: "All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Christ thus represents the Fatherhood of God as such because of his own Sonship, and denies that God is Father to any man in any kindred sense, until he has been specially revealed as such by the Son. As to the revelation of the Father to a man, Christ's meaning is found in his declaration, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." That is, distinctively as the first person of the Godhead, God is the Father to mankind only when they have become "the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Christ employed "my Father" fifty times, "your Father" seventeen times, and, "our Father" once.

The Sonship of Christ is represented in an equally objectionable way. "Christ was the Son of God. But remember in what sense he ever used this name,—Son of God because Son of man. He claims Sonship in virtue of his humanity."<sup>2</sup> "God created a divine humanity."<sup>3</sup> According to this, Jesus Christ was in his essential person as much a creature of God as Adam was, instead of being "the only begotten of the Father." He was not the eternal Son, but Son only when he became an inhabitant of this world. But against this preposterous doctrine it is sufficient to quote Christ's own language to the Father: "For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world."

His idea of the Spirit does not seem to be that he is a Person, equal with the Father and with the Son, and proceeding from the Father and the Son, but that he is simply an influence.

<sup>1</sup> Second Series, 73.<sup>2</sup> Life and Letters, II. 169.<sup>3</sup> Fourth Series, 343.

For in addition to what has been already quoted, he says that Christ "proclaimed a new name of God,—the Father; and a new name of man, or Humanity, the Son; a vital union, by a Spirit ever near, ever inward; 'a light lighting every man that cometh into the world.'" This seems to mean that the Spirit is the bond which unites the Father with the Son, or with humanity.

What kind of a being, then, did Robertson worship? He has not hesitated to answer in unambiguous terms. Speaking of Swedenborg, he says: "One grand truth he seems to have grasped, the fact of Divine Humanity as the only possible object of man's worship. He had besides identified Jesus Christ with this object. I have long felt the former of these positions, and I am more and more satisfied of the truth of the latter. Only a human God, and none other, must be adored by man."<sup>1</sup> Theodore Parker could hardly say anything more shocking to a reverent mind. It is impossible to make this equivalent to the God-man; for the divine was not human, and the human was not divine. Even now the human is not deified, but only glorified. The object of our worship, according to Christ, is God who is a spirit. Though we worship God through Christ as our mediator, or worship Christ as the second person of the Godhead, we worship God as manifest in or united with human nature, but not a human God.

With such views of inspiration, sin, atonement, and the Trinity, we should expect a very easy way of entrance into the kingdom. God being bound to the fixed laws of the universe, and having no real sovereignty, the Saviour could hardly be called God's unspeakable gift, and his death was not a special manifestation of God's love or of Christ's love to our race, but simply a philosophically demanded necessity in the government of God. And the Holy Spirit is to be credited with no special agency in the regeneration and salvation of sinners, since, "All who are born into the world are God's children by right. They are not so, in fact, until they recognize it, and believe it, and live as such. To believe it, and live it, is to be regenerate."<sup>2</sup> "We have a twofold nature,—the nature of the animal and the

<sup>1</sup> Life and Letters, I. 235<sup>2</sup> Life and Letters, II. 67.

nature of God, and in the order of God's providence we begin with the animal. When these natures are exchanged is the moment of spiritual regeneration."<sup>1</sup> Thus regeneration is within every sinner's power; if he wills to be regenerate he will have perhaps the aid of the Holy Spirit in the sense of God's providence, but he is not dependent upon any special agency of the Holy Spirit in the exercise of sovereignty. The variance of such views from the teaching of Christ and the Apostles is too obvious to need remark.

It is hardly worth the pains to examine his doctrinal views any further, except as it may be necessary incidentally in the examination of the principles which formed the basis of his teaching. These are stated by himself in a passage quoted by the biographer.<sup>2</sup> The first is, "The establishment of positive truth, instead of the negative destruction of error." Some of his hearers, and some of his readers, seem to have given him great credit in this direction. But without pretending that he did not destroy some error by the exhibition of positive truth in the place of it, we are sorry to be compelled to dissent from their judgment almost entirely so far as the leading doctrines of the Bible are concerned. There is abundance of positive statement, but his views upon the doctrines under review are for the most part erroneous. He wished to stand alone, and succeeded. Seizing upon a single aspect of truth, or upon a half-truth, he called to his aid his power of brilliant illustration, and dogmatized with little regard to the authority of God's word. The quotations from the Bible, by which he sought to fortify his statements, were often but accommodations in language, instead of proof-texts. And the doctrines of the Bible as held by evangelical churches and theologians were, in his view, the errors which he was most concerned to denounce and destroy. But if caricature and denunciation are equivalent to what he professed to avoid as "the negative destruction of error," it is only necessary to read his sermons with remembrance of this to see that he departed often and widely from his "principle."

His second principle is: "That truth is made up of two oppo-

<sup>1</sup> Fifth Series, 93.

<sup>2</sup> Life and Letters, II. 160—1.



site propositions, and not found in a *via media* between the two." We are told by Mr. Brooke that his best illustration of this principle is the sermon on the glory of the Virgin mother. It is fair to turn to that sermon.

"When Paul dared to proclaim of paganism what we are proclaiming of Virgin-worship, that paganism stood upon a truth, and *taught the truth*, paganism fell for ever. He did not undertake to prove it, in the Areopagus, a system of damnable idolatries; but he disengaged the truth from the error, proclaimed the truth, and left the errors to themselves. The truth grew up, and the errors silently and slowly withered."

The Apostle did denounce the idolatries of the Athenians, and warned them of the day of judgment; and paganism did not fall, and has not fallen yet, any more than Virgin-worship, which, we suspect, was at no greater discount in Trinity chapel at the close than at the beginning of the sermon.

"What lies at the root of this ineradicable Virgin-worship? . . . Before Christ the qualities honored as Divine were peculiarly the virtue of the man: Courage—Wisdom—Truth—Strength. But Christ proclaimed the Divine nature of qualities entirely opposite! Meekness—Obedience—Affection—Purity. . . . Here was a new, strange thought. . . . What marvel if the early Christian found that the Virgin-mother of our Lord embodied this great idea? . . . The truth alone which can supplant the worship of the Virgin is the perfect humanity of Jesus Christ."

He argues that Christ's humanity contained not simply what belonged to the masculine, but also what belonged to the feminine qualities of human nature; and that so soon as this is seen, Mariolatry must cease. This of course was a view entirely original with him. But that Christ's humanity contained all the essential characteristics of universal humanity, is in fact the common view of Christendom. It is the view of the Romanists. And the qualities in Mary for which they hold her to be a proper object of worship, are qualities which they believe Christ imparted to her by being born of her. This is what the priests teach and the people believe. The people, ignorant as they are of the Scriptures, have no other idea of Christ's humanity than that it contained the feminine as well as the masculine qualities of human nature. They understand

Christ's humanity as Robertson represents it, and yet worship the Virgin. His philosophy of the Virgin-worship is not the true one. And he would eradicate this idolatry by substituting another, the worship of Christ's humanity! "Let us acknowledge that what they worship is indeed deserving of all adoration; only let us say that *what* they worship is, ignorantly, Christ." Unless this specific shall be more potent hereafter than it has been during its first decade of years, there is little prospect of any appreciable result. Besides, if humanity is the proper object of worship, it may as well be worshipped in the sanctified and blessed Mary as in Jesus Christ. The worth of his principle is seen at once when logically stated: The feminine qualities of human nature are, in their purity, adorable; likewise also the masculine: The Virgin-mother embodied the former, at least proximately, but not the latter; but Jesus Christ embodied both perfectly: Therefore the worship of womanhood in the Virgin is idolatry, but the worship of womanhood and manhood united in the perfect humanity of Christ is Christianity! This being the best result of his second principle, it is unnecessary to exhibit any other application of it. Suffice it to say that the logical results of it, as applied in his sermons on baptism and absolution and the Sabbath, are equally absurd though less shocking.

His third principle is: "That spiritual truth is discerned by the spirit, instead of intellectually in propositions; and therefore, Truth should be taught suggestively, not dogmatically." Mr. Brooke says: "He believed that the highest truths were poetry,—to be felt, not proved; resting ultimately, not on the authority of the Bible or the church, but on that witness of God's Spirit in the heart of man, which is to be realized, not through the cultivation of the understanding, but by the loving obedience of the heart." With Paul the reception of the Gospel by inspiration was by spiritual discernment independent of dogmatic propositions; but he put the Gospel into didactic statements in preaching and writing, in order that a spiritual discernment might be elicited, by the truth as the means and the Spirit of truth as the efficient agency, in his hearers and readers. And he made the testimony of God, and not the consciousness of man, the source of ultimate appeal in reference to all spirit-

ual truth. The believer's spiritual discernment is not the condition to the truth, but the truth is the condition to his spiritual discernment. John says, "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." It is undoubtedly important to preach the Gospel, as much as possible, as spirit and life; but in order to do this Paul deemed it necessary to "Hold fast the form of sound words." Our Saviour understood how to teach suggestively; but his disciples failed to understand his parables until he taught them his meaning, by translating his rhetorical into logical statements. But Robertson has a sermon on this third principle; it is the first in the First Series, and on the text, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." It is interesting and suggestive; specially of things objectionable. The Apostle uses the text in vindication of his course in declaring exclusively the testimony of God, and in explanation of the way in which he received that testimony; Robertson uses it as equally applicable to all men, and in vindication of the principle that spiritual truth is discerned by the spirit, instead of intellectually in propositions. Following the topical order of the text, he says: "1. Eternal truth is not perceived through sensation. 'Eye hath not seen.' 2. Eternal truth is not reached by hearsay. 'Ear hath not heard.'" Here is a distinction without a difference; hearing belongs to sensation no less than seeing. A man, claimed to have been well-read in philosophy, and nice in the use of terms, should not have made such a blunder. Besides, though the Gospel came to Paul "by revelation of Jesus Christ," it comes to the people by the telling and the hearing. But he continues: "3. Truth is not discoverable by the heart—'Neither have entered into the heart.'" And then, after ascribing to the heart "the power of affection," he says: "The condition upon which this self-revelation of the Spirit is made to man is Love." Confusion of notions, contradiction in statements, and unwarrantable deductions; but this sermon is by no means a solitary specimen.

His fourth principle is: "That belief in the human character

of Christ's humanity must be antecedent to belief in his divine origin." In opposition to this it is submitted, that Christ said to the doubting and experimenting disciple, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed": that all who saw him on earth believed in the human character of his humanity, yet but very few believed in his divine origin: and that it is impossible for any sane mind to believe that he was the son of a Virgin-mother, without the antecedent belief of his divine origin.

His fifth principle is: "That Christianity, as its teachers should, works from the inward to the outward, and not *vice versa*." Partly true, and partly false: Christianity as vital personal religion, does indeed work from a germ of spiritual life begotten in the soul by the Holy Spirit, and unfolding into the manifestation of Christian character and conduct; but the ministry must employ the analytical as well as the synthetical method of presenting the truth, and must work largely from the objective to the subjective.

His sixth and last principle is: "The soul of goodness in things evil." It does not appear that he was any more acute and skilful than many other men, in detecting and bringing to light the truth that lurks in erroneous theories and systems. As already seen, he sometimes thought he detected the truth, but seized upon error. This principle seems to have been a hobby which he often rode into the sharp angle of two walls. The whole course of his teaching is vitiated by the attempt to find good in all evil, and to show men of all schools and sects and parties that his views, though he stood alone, were nearer than theirs to the pure white light of unadulterated truth. His prevailing tone is as if he thought that wisdom would die with him. A more opinionated preacher is seldom found. He tried to be genial and charitable, but his geniality and charitableness were usually if not always greatest in respect of those who were in the greatest error, and least toward those who were the most evangelical. He was a daring speculator, as well as a daring doubter, and always determined to solve his difficulties if possible alone. But his doubts were always, to use one of his favorite expressions, "vulgar," instead of original,

and when he had philosophized his way a single step beyond the vulgar, he thought he had found the true solution. Hence when he proclaimed his sympathy with those who were in the meshes of scepticism, they seem to have been sometimes readily conciliated and led along to his conclusion, as the promised land towards which they had been groping. His reasoning was often incoherent and illogical, yet garnished by a rhetoric which made his sophistry captivating. He saw some truths perhaps in their pure transparency, but often, if not generally, the vivid aspects which filled his mental vision were not rays from the true source, but reflections from opaque errors. He was a good illustration of the saying, "that no opinions so fatally mislead us, as those that are not wholly wrong, as no watches so effectually deceive the wearer, as those that are sometimes right." If instead of going to Shakespeare for a fundamental principle of pulpit instruction, he had resorted to the word of God and adopted that of "Jesus Christ and him crucified," he might have enjoyed incomparably greater peace in his own soul, and might have been instrumental of incomparably greater good to the souls of his hearers, though in that case it is hardly probable that his works would have been published.

Where, now, in the theological world shall Robertson be located? Though a communicant and a minister in the church of England, that was not his proper place. He denounced High Churchism and Low Churchism. He can not be claimed with justice by the Universalists, though he stood upon the verge of their system, his "only difficulty" being "how not to believe in everlasting punishment." The Unitarians can not claim him, if they take his disclaimers; though they might claim him by the same method of sophistical reasoning which he used to prove that "Dr. Channing adored Christ" in spite of all his own assertions to the contrary. He could not go with Theodore Parker in all things, though he admired him for many. Of Bushnell he had no sanguine hope, and with Newman he disagreed. "He was the child of no theological father." A writer in the *Brighton Gazette* assigns him "to what is denominated the 'Broad Church.'" His sympathies were generous towards all but the evangelical. He admitted to communion "both Unitarians and Quakers, as well as men of other sects."

He took great pride in standing alone. He declared his motto to be, "None but Christ"; yet he was careful to explain, in the most un-Christ-like spirit, "Not in the (so-called) evangelical sense, which I take to be the sickliest cant that has appeared since the Pharisees bore record to the gracious words which He spake, and then tried to cast him headlong from the hill of Nazareth." He was simply and thoroughly a humanitarian. The humanity of Christ was his ideal. That he preached, and that he declared to be the only proper object of worship. He took comfort in finding the parallel of his own poor success in the contempt and misrepresentation which Christ suffered; being careful to liken the Evangelicals to the Pharisees, and as if criticism and distrust were sure vouchers for the truth and soundness of his sentiments. As no sect or school can justly claim him, so, it would seem, all can agree to let him stand alone, and as he styled himself, "a theological Ishmael."

Had he lived to old age he would have died undoubtedly with different views. Whether he would have changed for Romanism, or for Rationalism, or for Unitarianism, it is in vain to conjecture; but, that he would have changed, seems almost certain. He had strong tendencies towards each of these forms of error, but his pride of opinion, and of standing alone, might have prevented him from identifying himself with any sect or school or party. But he could hardly have remained where he was. He built upon sand, and his edifice must have fallen. He was restless and dissatisfied and inconsistent. His prejudices were violent, and dislike of men would make him desert their principles. This accounts in considerable degree for the change that took place in his views during his short career. His biographer thinks his views were unalterably fixed, but they seem to have been so, only because he was cut down before there was time for another revolution.

It is natural for his readers to estimate him according to the entertainment they find in his writings. Those who agree with him in the main, and those, a much larger class, who are chiefly interested in his caricatures and condemnations of Christian doctrine as commonly received, and in his coarse and even "savage" thrusts at those who are the most truly evangelical, will rate him at a vastly higher value, than those who judge him

by the only true rule, his agreement with, or departure from the word of God. His writings have considerable merit for raciness, brilliancy, and variety. His lectures on the Epistles to the Corinthians certainly exhibit a proof that expository preaching is not necessarily dull. It were well if the Bible were expounded in course from the pulpit, if expounded truly, much more than it is. It were well, too, if ministers would learn to trust themselves to preach, not without preparation, but without a manuscript. His sermons may contribute something toward so desirable an improvement. But whoever reads them to find solid and sound instruction in respect of the fundamental doctrines of our holy religion, or to quicken and invigorate the pulsations of true spiritual life, will find but little to reward him.

Mr. Robertson's life is a sad one to contemplate. By his natural endowments, both physical and intellectual, his means of culture and his position of influence, he ought to have been a powerful instrument in the advancement of evangelical knowledge and vital godliness in the world. His local popularity, his present fame, and the influence of his published works, may seem to many enough to satisfy the loftiest ambition, and to prove him an extraordinary benefactor to his race. But he departed from the fundamental truths of Christianity (if indeed he had ever rightly apprehended them) and gave himself to the inculcation of the most pernicious errors. The influence of these errors was very deleterious upon his own character, leading him to discard the works of evangelical authors for those of such men as Newman, Martineau, and Carlyle, Emerson, Parker, and Channing, and to forsake the fellowship of those who believed and adorned the doctrines of God our Saviour, for that of sceptics and free-thinkers. As regards the true character and ends of the Christian ministry, therefore, his career must be deemed a failure. By the efforts of a certain school of errorists, his works may be kept before the public for a few years, but they are not destined to permanence. His fame must necessarily be of short continuance.

Of the causes of his failure, a few are very palpable. One was the excessive morbidness which pervaded his feelings, his thinking, and his intercourse with mankind. It seems to have



resulted partly from a delicate nervous organization, which rendered him unduly sensitive; partly from a disposition to indulge in reveries, which made him uncertain and vacillating; and partly from the strong passions which made him intense in his likes and dislikes, gloomy in his disappointments, and conceited in his opinions. It discolored his life, preyed upon his energies, and contributed to the ruin of his health and to his early death; and yet it was one of the elements that occasioned his popularity with his hearers and with his readers.

Another was the ever present consciousness that he was not in the profession of his choice. Born of a military family, "rocked and cradled to the roar of artillery," his predilections for military life were hereditary, and amounted to an unconquerable passion. To this he looked forward during his childhood and youth. For it he spent several years in preparatory study, while waiting in vain for a commission. And when at last, at the earnest solicitation of his father, he consented to adopt the profession of the ministry, it was with an almost crushing feeling of reluctance. A sense of disappointment followed him through all his subsequent life. It is frequently manifested in his sermons and in his letters. According to his own account he "could not see a regiment manœuvre, nor artillery in motion, without a choking sensation."

A third was a deficient education. His whole collegiate and theological course of study was comprised in three years at the University of Oxford. Even this wanted system, being largely optional instead of prescribed. He afterwards regretted that he had not submitted to be guided by his instructors, and lamented that the church of England furnished no facilities for a "systematic preparation for the ministry." His discipline at Oxford was evidently impaired by his contact with Tractarianism, which occupied his mind prematurely, and, in spite of all his objections to some of its features, sowed the seeds of those doubts which in subsequent years developed into such a complete revolution of his theological views. This deficiency in his education is apparent in the structure and style of his sermons, and in his processes of reasoning. The claim that he "was a master in logic," and an exemplification of Schiller's maxim that "you do not know a subject thoroughly until you can play with it,"

is a specimen of that sheer nonsense into which the adulations of friendship are so apt to degenerate. Sophistry and rhetorical dash are characteristics which no candid and discriminating reader can deny. There is no evidence that the writings of Plato, Aristotle and Edwards "had passed like the iron atoms of the blood into his mental constitution." He has shown himself incompetent, not only to solve, but also to apprehend, in clearness and consistency, the fundamental problems of Christian theology. By his own admission, his system was vague.

The main cause of his failure, however, was a deficient experience of the truths of evangelical religion. This deficiency is painfully apparent throughout his "Life and Letters," as well as in his sermons. The reader may look in vain for any account of his experience of what the Saviour described as being "born of the Spirit," and as having "passed from death unto life." We are told of "his deep religious feeling," as one of the reasons why "the church was proposed to him as a profession" by his father; and of "his realization of Christ as his Saviour" while at the University, as "the cumulative result of many years of prayer and struggle." But we are told of "his religion, before it had consciously taken a distinctively Christian form," partaking of the nature of "the old religion of chivalry." At Winchester he prescribed to himself a course of austerities and outward observances, and read "books of devotion." Such religion, however, the biographer says, "weakened everything he wrote," so that his "letters of this time are scarcely worth reading." Passages from one or two written prayers are given, which indicate a desire to live in consecration to Christ; but by themselves they prove no more than similar extracts from the writings of notoriously irreligious men. "It is impossible not to feel," says Mr. Brooke, "when he got rid of all this, and felt its fruitlessness and its antagonism to the true spirit of the life of Christ, how he sprang from a dwarf into a giant." It is obvious enough that he "got rid of all this," but not that he passed into such an improved spiritual state. Judging by the scriptural rule, "By their fruits ye shall know them," it is almost impossible not to feel that he sadly degenerated. Certainly he came to hate the doctrines which he had once adopted as fundamental to religion. He

also came to hate those who continued in the faith and exemplification of those doctrines. His biographer admits that, "If there was any intolerance in his nature it oozed out here." He himself declared: "As I adore Christ, exactly in that proportion do I abhor that which calls itself Evangelicalism. I feel more at brotherhood with a wronged, mistaken, maddened, sinful chartist, than I do with that religious world." After he departed from their faith, he could hardly speak of evangelical Christians except in language surcharged with gall. In reading his language concerning them, one is painfully reminded of the Apostolic declarations: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death. . . . For he that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?" The Unitarian type of piety was much more congenial to Robertson. "What care I," said he, "if Dr. Channing adores, saying that he does not adore." It was not very complimentary, however, to speak of Channing's biographer's piety as "immeasurably below his." This dislike of the evangelical portion of Christendom was aggravated rather than mitigated by time. About two years before his death, without provocation, and in a letter of calm advice to a young man respecting his studies, he deliberately declared that "religious people are generally the weakest of mankind." It must have been a strange piety, that manifested itself spontaneously in contempt and hatred of those who manifest most the spirit of Christ. And the secret of its strangeness may be found in the fact, stated by himself as "the result of a scrutiny," that his love for Christ was, "not because of any reference to his love for me, which somehow or other never enters into my mind." The contrast of such an experience with the Apostle's is significant; "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. . . . We love him, because he first loved us."

The sermons of Mr. Robertson are to be classed with the most dangerous of modern religious publications. His acknowledged excellences only render his defects the more potent. His readers are liable to be deceived, as he doubtless deceived himself, by a style which was rambling and diffuse, and over-

loaded with rhetorical illustrations; and also by the indefiniteness and brevity of his statements in regard to points which he wished to enforce in opposition to sentiments commonly received. The poison is sugared over so deeply as to be liable to be taken with relish and without suspicion, except by "those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." He talks a great deal about Christ, but for the most part without the proper name. He seems to have had a morbid preference for the pronouns "He," "His," and "Him." He talks also much of the cross, but for the most part means not the cross of final and atoning suffering, but the cross of lifelong privation and rejection. When he speaks of Christ he generally means, not the Son of God in union with a human nature, but the Son of man as the "blossom of our common humanity." It is on account of such a style that many read him with approval and delight, misunderstanding his meaning; and are surprised when at length they detect the deception.

Perhaps some who have read these works may think that this article is too disparaging. His defects, however, have not been exaggerated. Much more might have been extracted on the points examined, of the same kind as these quotations. On several other topics his sentiments are at variance with the Scriptures. On almost every important doctrine he is inconsistent with himself. Numerous sentences might be quoted which, taken alone, would prove him to have been substantially orthodox. But these do not neutralize his errors. It is not necessary to quote them in order to estimate him fairly. Many of his statements, which seem correct in themselves, are seen to be erroneous in the light of the context, and of other declarations on the same subjects. His defects are largely in excess of his excellences, and therefore his works are to be condemned rather than commended. The unsound portions taint all the rest. That which seems to be in accordance with God's word is in effect but the disguise under which that which is contrary to God's word pleads for a charitable construction. His false position as a minister, his employment of technical terms in unusual senses, and his occasional strictures upon Universalists and Unitarians and Tractarians, constitute just that advantage which errorists so much desire in the work of

proselyting. The so-called liberal school would not be so fulsome in praise and commendation of his works if it did not regard them as a specially good lever for overturning the Orthodox system of faith. It is well for the defenders of the faith always to have reference to the interpretation which latitudinarians put upon the works they commend to the public. It is in vain to hope that the works of Robertson will carry a sufficient antidote to the errors they inculcate. Their prevailing tone and their legitimate influence are not evangelical.

These sermons, in connection with the letters which explain them, should be an admonition against a style of preaching so profusely rhetorical. As in the case of this author, so in that of such as shall attempt to preach like him, truth will be sacrificed to fancy. Imagination "is a vain thing for safety," unless held under control by the reins of reason, and by the brakes of a remorseless logic. The fascination of brilliant metaphor may easily carry unguarded preachers, as well as their hearers, beyond the bounds of what is written in the testimony of God. Rhetoric is good, if it be employed to enforce instead of concealing the truth. No better rule can be found than that of the Apostle, who said: "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." The preacher who adopts the contrary rule may succeed in securing popularity with that portion of the community that prize the sanctuary chiefly as a place of intellectual entertainment, but he will sooner or later be heard with disapprobation, or be left with disgust, by such of his congregation as "try the spirits whether they are of God." It was so with the author of these sermons. "As his peculiar views developed themselves, many of the old congregation left the church." Their places were rapidly filled up. This process began very soon after he went to Brighton, and seems to have continued through his whole ministry there; for near the close of it he lamented, "That enthusiasm, and affection, and trust, and perhaps respect, towards me have cooled." Those who frequented the house of God for the sake of worshipping him in spirit and in truth, were evidently not content with sermons in

which they were directed to "feel Christ and live him," without having the truth of "Christ and him crucified" as the object and support of that faith, which is the essential condition to all genuine religious feeling. Could Robertson have lived, and, like Chalmers, have been converted from his errors to the truth as it is in Jesus, his preaching would have been greatly modified, his hatred of evangelical Christians would have turned to love, and his usefulness, even though confined to his own congregation, might have been "gold, silver, precious stones," instead of "wood, hay, stubble." Unless there could have been such a radical change, he died not too soon for the spiritual welfare of his people, or for his own posthumous fame. There is indeed a fascinating power in his works, but it must be ascribed, in his own language respecting the vain, boastful, jealous, and irascible Italian artist, Cellini, to "The imaginativeness of a brain, which had in it a fibre of insanity, near which genius often lies."

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE ART OF NOT GROWING OLD.

WE all have heard the story of the man who had a knife, which in the course of time was renewed in all its several parts, blade, rivets, handle and the rest, till at last no part of the original knife was left; and yet its owner declared that it was the same old knife.

Looking upon the changes which occur during life in individual character, it almost seems to us that identity can be affirmed of it only as it was affirmed of that knife by its owner. For, as Coleridge says, "Men exist in fragments." One change after another takes place, until little or nothing appears to be left of the original person. This is true of each department of his nature, the moral, the intellectual, the physical. We die daily, and we are renewed day by day. With each stage of life we put something off, and take some new quality on. "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I

thought as a child, but when I became a man, I put away childish things": I put them away and received the traits proper to manhood. Childhood's glee and careless spirit, its fresh and exuberant feelings, its ready faith and impulsiveness, these are succeeded by sober reflection, greater wariness of confidence, and a graver temperament. We do not see with the same eyes as formerly, nor feel with the same heart.

"Whither is fled the visionary gleam?  
Where is it now, the glory and the dream?"

Time has stolen us away from what we then were, and disguised our personalities under new sets of qualities. He has wrought a trick upon us similar to that which gipsies are said sometimes to practice, who steal horses, and so artfully clip and color them as to quite change their appearance, so that they even sell them to their owners, with no suspicion on the part of the latter that they are buying their own beasts.

How much can we recognize of our former selves in what we now are? Take from its place on the shelf the daguerreotype of yourself that was taken twenty or twenty five years ago, and you will say as Southey did:

"I search myself in vain, and find no trace  
Of what I was."

Or let the mother take from her drawer of precious keepsakes that of her son, now a man, taken when he was a child. How little resemblance to the present person is discoverable in it! If all recollection of its origin and existence could be effaced, so that it should be regarded as some strange picture, you would not trace any likeness in it to yourself; the mother would not know it as representing her child. It might awaken in her mind a gleam of reminiscence, as a face which she had sometime seen, and excite an unaccountable feeling of tenderness in her mother heart; but long reflection would be required ere she could recognize it. Had her child died at that time instead of living to grow up, she would recognize it quickly enough; because in that case the image preserved in her mind would remain unaltered as it then was, no insensible modification having been made in it to correspond with the slow changes of time.



This suggests a strange paradox. Death does not deprive a mother of her child so much as life does. Death rather embalms it. Years afterward the mother will think of it as still a child. The sweet face it then had, and pretty, winsome ways, it has always. Though it may have had brothers and sisters, of nearly the same age, who have lived to grow up, and who with growth, have lost every vestige of what they were when that little brother or sister died; though beautiful sunny childhood in them has been displaced by the graver and harder features of maturity, and this might suggest a similar change in the one that was lost, she still clings to the child's image. She feels no inclination to alter it as time would have done, and as time has changed the features and characters of those who have lived. She does not attempt to fill out nature's interrupted plan, by picturing the face which those childish features would have grown to, had it lived to be a man. She could not do it if she would. Life alone can tell what sort of a man's face a child's face may become. She therefore preserves the image as it was; it has no growth henceforth; and when she herself shall die and be united to the child, she thinks she shall find it unchanged. She reckons not of any celestial growth it may experience, more surprising than that of earth. Such a possibility has no practical influence upon her mind, and can not rob her of the joy of believing that she shall sometime lift it to her arms and cradle it in her bosom, as she did ere it died. And so she remains with the feelings of a young mother to the end of her days. She may live to a great age, and all her other feelings wither away, but these are nourished and kept alive by the immortal child which she secretly tends in her thoughts as of old.

It is life then and not death which bereaves parents of their children. They die to live and live to die.

"What if the death angel had spared her darling to the mother," says an eloquent writer, "can she retain him? Impossible! The inevitable years will steal away her child as surely as any mortal disease. It is our living children that we lose, not the dead. Do you doat on the infant beauty which you fold in your arms? Say farewell—you will never see it again."

"Ah! how doth beauty like a dial hand

Steal from his figure and no pace perceived."

The old belief in the transmigration of the soul through different bodies, is not so absurd after all. We here see something that might easily have suggested it. The soul in the course of a long life has many transmigrations. Infancy, childhood, youth, maturity and old age, each of these stages has its own body, unlike in appearance to that of any other—almost as much so as if they belonged to different persons. Indeed, we may say, without extravagance, that in the course of a long life one represents several different individuals. Imagine to yourself an old man who has descendants to the fourth generation. Suppose also, as often happens, that a family likeness exists among them all. He sees pictured in them all the stages of his own past life. His son, now quite well advanced, whose hair is turning gray, represents what he himself was twenty five years ago. His grandson, in the flush and strength of early manhood, shows what he was fifty years ago. Lastly, the little child of that grandson brings back to him the image of his far off childhood, what he was when a laughing, happy child. Look upon this group, considering what they severally represent. A family resemblance may be traced between them all, yet with as great differences as exist among individuals between whom there is no kinship. Has not the soul of the aged patriarch inhabited various bodies. It has had no permanent abiding place, but dwelt in shifting tabernacles. And these physical changes are but types of the changes which pass over the soul! If infantile and childhood's beauty have only a vanishing existence, and die with the continuance of life, so do their innocence and faith. The most wicked and depraved were once possessors of these.

"It is strange to think," says the writer above quoted, "that the most bronzed and hardened face that meets us on our daily walk; the face on which the world and sin have set their coarsest and most forbidding stamp, was once the face of a little child, over which fond parents doated and dreamed their dreams. There are bitterer partings than death, and more heart-rending farewells than those we breathe over the grave."

It was in the same vein of thought that the mother of the Wesleys said, "It is better to mourn ten children dead than one living. What parent has not had the same thoughts? If our

hopes must perish in the one way or the other ; if the child of our love may not grow up to a worthy and honored manhood, let us have at least what comfort there may be in the choice of burial. It is better to lay those hopes in a little child's grave, than to see them sepulchered in a wicked man. We have read the sad story of a mother, who, when her child was sick and thought to be dying, called, in agony, upon her minister to pray for its recovery. He did so. But when, in the course of his petition, he went on to pray that, if God in his infinite wisdom, forecasting the future, saw that death would be better for the child than life, and had decided it so, the mother might acquiesce in his will, she would not suffer him to proceed. "No, no," she said, "not that, not that, I can not give up my child on any terms ! Pray only that it may live." The child did live, but to become a hardened criminal and murderer, whom the mother followed broken-hearted to the scaffold. In this instance death had been a blessed angel compared with life ; and the mother's fond importunity that it might live was unconscious cruelty to her child. That angel would have transplanted it like a bud, to blossom in heaven and bloom there forever ; but she drove him away, to see its beauty and glory turn to corruption, to exhale a poison that should torture her soul and embitter her life.

If such mournful reflections occur to one when considering the changes for the worse which time has wrought in others, much more sad are they if he is conscious of having experienced them in himself. Alas ! what depredations may be committed in the moral character in the course of a few years. What a heartless, wicked robber, this life would be proved, if all these losses could be laid to his charge. Who that has ever read it, has not been touched by a passage in Charles Lamb's Essay upon New Year's Eve ? Its tone is half sportive, but you feel from the way it takes hold of the heart, that the writer was more than half in earnest.

"Do I advance a paradox, when I say, that, skipping over the intervention of forty years, a man may have leave to love himself without the imputation of self-love. If I know aught of myself, no one whose mind is introspective, and mine is painfully so, can have a less respect for his present identity than I for

the man Elia. I know him to be light, and vain, and humorsome; a notorious . . . ; addicted to . . . ; averse from counsel, neither taking it nor offering it;— . . . besides, a stammering buffoon; what you will; lay on and spare not; I subscribe to it all, and much more than thou canst be willing to lay at his door—but for the child Elia, that ‘other me,’ there, in the back ground, I must take leave to cherish the remembrance of that young master, with as little reference, I protest, to this stupid changeling of five and forty, as if it had been the child of some other house, and not of my parents. . . . I know how it shrank from any, the least color of falsehood. God help thee, Elia, how art thou changed! Thou art sophisticated. I know how honest, how courageous (for a weakling) it was, how religious, how imaginative, how hopeful. From what have I not fallen, if the child I remember was indeed myself, and not some dissembling guardian, presenting a false identity, to give a rule to my unpractised steps, and regulate the tone of my moral being.”

There can be nothing more pathetic than such a retrospect, when it really has nothing but a downward course of demoralization to rest upon. An old man’s reverie over the waste which death has created in the circle of his friends is, in no respect, to be compared with it. For his sorrow is tempered by many sweet recollections of those friends, in which they still live to him; and by the thought of those blessings enjoyed from their affection and intercourse, which death could not take away from him. The influence for good which they had over him, the pure thoughts and noble aspirations, and better purposes inspired by them, are safely garnered up in the heart and character, out of the reach of the spoiler. And, besides, there is the dear hope of going to them, if they can not return to him. But what comfort can he have who mourns for dead and buried virtues? Their memory can bring only remorse and the despair of feeling that they can never be restored. Our Whittier has touchingly portrayed the feelings of one around whom death has created a solitude, in the cry:

“How strange it seems with so much gone  
Of life and love, to still live on.”

But where shall we find words sufficiently expressive of the surprise and grief of him whose heart has become gradually vacated of the good and noble qualities that may once have

occupied it. "Who can see worse days," asks Lord Bacon, "than he that yet living doth follow at the funerals of his own reputation."

But, happily, all changes are not thus for the worse. Normally and properly they are for the better. Transition from one stage to another properly brings increase of wisdom, virtue and strength. Change is growth, and growth is rightly only ascending to a greater height of excellence; such as the chrysalis acquires when it changes into a butterfly. We lose, to be sure, as in the passage from childhood to the stage above it, some charming traits that we often deplore; yet their loss is more than made up in what we gain. We should not be willing to remain always children, for all their attractive qualities. It is nobler to have a man's strength and reach of thought and power of high achievement, than to remain forever sporting in the sunshine of childhood. We love to look into its eager eyes, and contemplate its faith, its hope and its buoyancy; we wish that we might recover and always retain its freshness of feeling, when all experience was like a gushing fountain, and the water of life had not yet grown flat and insipid. But though these things are gone, never to return, we have had faculties and qualities developed, which, while grave in character, are far more valuable. The waters have broadened and deepened, if they have lost their sparkling freshness and iridescence. The spiritual beauty of a saint, though tinged with sadness, is of a more exalted kind than that of a laughing faun. So is manhood superior to any of the gayer periods that precede it. Each new stage, into which the soul enters in its transmigrations, is better, in some respects, than the last. We think this may be said of the very last of all, which is old age, notwithstanding its infirmities. Its calm wisdom, its chastened patience, and its ripened trust form the cap-sheaf of human acquirements.

The history of a soul in conjunction with these changes of life, whereby it is continually advancing from one set of qualities and condition to another, is beautifully imaged in the life of the chambered nautilus. Thus has a poet described it:

"Year after year beheld the silent toil,  
That spread its lustrous coil;  
Still, as the spiral grew,  
He left the past year's dwelling for the new,  
Stole with soft step the shining archway through,  
Built up its idle door,  
Stretched in his last found home and knew the old no more."

Seeing in every natural object a lesson for man, this is the lesson which the poet gathers from it :

"Build thee more stately mansions, oh, my soul.  
As the swift seasons roll,  
Leave thy low vaulted past;  
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,  
Shut thee from heaven, with a dome more vast;  
Till thou at length art free,  
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea."

Let us now consider the principle of coherency, which binds together all these diverse stages and makes of them one life. We call it personal identity. It is what the string is in a coil of beads; it connects the first with the last, and all between. Though men exist in fragments, between these fragments there is a vital union. One grows naturally, in the course of development, out of the other, as the full grown plant, crowned with its consummate flower, is a growth through intermediate stages, from the first tender germ. As the experiences of life are strung upon the memory, so are all its stages upon our personal identity. It may be hard to recognize the child in the man, yet the same personality is in both. "The child is father to the man," in the sense, that the man has sprung from the child.

It is now a proper question to consider, whether the real identity which exists, can not, and should not, be kept more apparent than it is. Whether the loss which the soul encounters in its progress, though compensated by a greater gain, can not be avoided? Whether, in short, the old man may not retain and exhibit all the charming traits of every antecedent stage, even to that of childhood; and so life be grandly cumulative, and the character made to conserve everything valuable in the course of it? Commonly, men traverse it as a reaper might walk through a field gathering grain, who should let fall, as he

advanced, some part of what he has before secured, instead of holding all fast and safe in his bosom.

It was a saying of Coleridge, that a man should grow up like a tree. That is, no matter what the present stage of life is, or however far advanced, it should include in itself all that has gone before, as a tree enfolds under the last year's growth the growths of all the years of its existence. "So Dr. Chalmers," says the author of *Spare Hours*, "bore along with him his childhood, his youth, his early and full manhood into his mature old age. This gave him infinite delight, multiplied his joys, strengthened and sweetened his own nature, and kept his heart young and tender. It enabled him to sympathize, to have a fellow feeling, with all of whatever age." No doubt we all have met, and can recall some one or more of such rare persons. How rich a nature is it, which has thus gathered into itself, and holds in store all that is sweet and beautiful in life—the delightful traits of all its different bygone periods? It is like some rare nosegay, supplied by the gardener's art from greenhouse plants, in which the flowers that adorn the several months of the year should be gathered, to mingle their fragrance. It has the joyousness of childhood, the genial sense of youth, and the ripe results of age. It makes its possessor the easy companion of all classes. The young, instead of shunning him, as querulous, morose and uninteresting, will crowd into his presence and delight in his converse. A beautiful identity will be manifest throughout. The stream can be traced through all its course, and all its stages will be mirrored in the last.

Such a power of self-conservation, if we may so term it, may be in part a natural gift. In the most striking instances of its existence, it always is so, probably. Yet can not all men acquire something of it? We think so. We should be slow to believe that age ever necessarily freezes the genial current of the soul, or strips it of any of its grace. In the natural course of things, it should become more and more enriched with the progress of time, and not grow sterile. Every lovely trait which nature gives us, she gives to be ours forever, and not merely for a season, to be then taken back. She would have them all stored in the character, as a wife keeps, in



some precious casket, the jewels which her husband, from time to time, has given her. Only let care be taken to preserve them, and she will not willingly let them die.

This is something which it especially concerns those who are engaged in the Christian ministry to consider. For if any one should carry in himself all the periods of life, and be "a part of all he has met" in the course of it, it is the man, whose office it is to deal with people, who are from all of life's stages. How else can he imitate the apostle's example, of being "all things to all men," that he may thus "win" them to Christ. He aims to gather fruits unto the Lord from young and old, from youth and manhood. But this can be done only through a breadth of nature, in which all may find something congenial and which can therefore adapt itself to all. It is a frequent complaint among those in the ministry, that as they grow old, their congregations become weary of them, and desire to have younger men. Age, which is a recommendation in other professions, is reckoned almost a disqualification in theirs. No doubt it is all wrong. The wisdom gained by the experience of years, should be considered as valuable in the office of the ministry as elsewhere, and even more so, as its work is more important, and justly demands the exercise of the highest skill. But may it not be that this disaffection toward elderly ministers, and preference of young men, is due, in some part, to neglect of that which we have been considering? Have pastors been careful enough to preserve their youthful feelings, or to cultivate sympathies which shall afford points of contact for all ages? We have had the happiness to become acquainted with a few men in the ministry who have enjoyed very long pastorates, and all of them, if memory informs us correctly, were men who possessed this broadness of sympathy, or universality of nature, which made them easy and agreeable companions to all. They had garnered in themselves all that life develops of sweet and genial qualities. Age, instead of disqualifying them in the thought of their people, improved them; for it increased their moral possessions. Their congregations did not keep them by sufferance. On the contrary, they prized and enjoyed them more and more. Had it been proposed to their people to exchange their pastors for younger men, they would have

answered, as the writer once heard one answer, who had enjoyed and appreciated the ministrations of such a man; "Exchange our pastor for a younger man? No sir! Our old minister is better than a dozen young ones."

This appreciative reply of a layman suggests that a kind and generous treatment of their pastor by his people, may do much to keep him young. Care, heavy pecuniary burdens, salary so stinted that it allows no replenishment of his library, anything, in short, that weighs him down with anxiety or tends to depress and sour his spirits, will hasten the decay of those qualities, wherein the freshness and charm of youth consist. Reflecting upon the peculiar hardships that have been endured by those in the ministry, in the last five years, on account of depreciated salaries, from which many have obtained no relief from their people, the thought occurs, "How sadly have these years told upon the youthful spirits and geniality of poor clergymen!" Those churches and parishes, that have not tried to diminish this hardship of their pastors by suitable indemnity, have no right to complain of them, if they are now growing dull. For they have suffered their cheerfulness, elasticity and freshness to be crushed out of them by burdens too grievous to be borne. In stead of having any right to complain of them, it is theirs to complain of their people, and they might, if it would do any good, demand of them the restoration of their lost youth, of which meanness and neglect have robbed them. It is not too late to make reparation now. Let those, who deserve the rebuke, make haste to do it. It may bring back life and bloom to faculties almost withered, and fountains of youth that seem forever closed, may be opened again to flow perennially. But this is a partial digression. We were asserting our belief, that a man never need grow old, in the sense of becoming dull and uncongenial.

Some one may say: "This is all very fine, and the thing recommended desirable to be possessed, but by what modes or rules can it be realized? How is one to preserve himself from the corrosion of time?"

Perhaps it is not possible to lay down any rules of general application, and it were not wise to attempt it. It may be better to let every man decide what remedies against the evil de-

plored, would be suitable for his particular case. There are such diversities of disposition, and such differences in the circumstances of men, that what might profit one would not another. A homely proverb declares that "What is one man's meat is another's poison." So a practical precept, which is a good article of moral and intellectual diet for some cases, may fail to secure health to all. But there are a few directions which can scarcely ever operate unfavorably, while most likely to assist us in resisting those tendencies of age, which narrow the range of our sympathies.

One direction of great importance is, to cherish a love for youthful society. Bathe the spirit in the genial atmosphere which hangs about childhood and youth. It will prove a true fountain of youth, in its power to arrest the decay of happy, generous qualities. Endeavor to enter, with a ready sympathy, into the feelings of the young. Let no man think it beneath his dignity to participate even in their games and amusements. Tread the paths along which in youth you sported. Do not let the grass grow up in them, keep them open and worn by constant use. Why, when we have extended the range of life in one direction, should we narrow it in another? Forsake no portion of the field. Not only enter upon new experiences every year, but keep alive the old. Afraid of violating propriety or of sacrificing dignity! It is an empty fear. Read the beautiful account which Dr. Brown gives of Dr. Chalmers engaging with hearty enjoyment in the sports of children, as much a child for the time as the youngest among them. And, yet, who ever had more real dignity of character than Chalmers, or was more observant of life's true proprieties? Unless austerity is a synonym for dignity, and squeamishness for propriety, there is nothing in such familiarity with the young that will do injury to either. Such sympathy and intercourse will keep in exercise those feelings that are congenial to the young, and so the youthful sentiments of the heart may be kept from decay. The reason that it loses its vivacity and early warmth is, because those feelings are neglected and repressed. They die from inaction. They would retain their vitality, if they had a chance for exercise or any means of cultivation. But in following the apostolic example of putting

away childish things, people think it necessary to put an end to all that is found in the heart of children, their wholesome mirth and vivacity, and so smother their feelings by violent repression, or let them die from neglect. They forget that those qualities which are thus destroyed, and which especially characterize the earlier periods of life, become equally well all ages; that they are like evergreens in the landscape, which, though more bright and vigorous in the summer, yet adorn with a delightful beauty in the winter, their greenness contrasting cheerfully with the desolations of the season, and seeming to connect the year's decline with the freshness and glory of its spring.

Frequent, therefore, youthful society, if you would remain young in feeling. Unbend occasionally from the severer and graver pursuits of manhood, and be a boy again. Do not suffer the early susceptibilities of the heart to perish. We have alluded to Coleridge's notion that human growth should be like the growth of a tree. But in a tree the sap circulates through the inner layers, as well as through the outer; through the tissue that was formed earliest, as well as through what was formed last. If it did not, the tree would grow rotten at the heart. It is kept green and sound throughout, from being constantly pervaded throughout, by the currents of life. So a man might keep himself thoroughly alive, from centre to circumference, and throughout the whole range of human feeling, and susceptibilities, by duly exercising all. Let the energies of life not fail from any part. Do not suffer the core of life to perish from desuetude. Let the child still live in the man, and consider that when it does not, the man is as defective as a tree whose heart has decayed.

If one is so happy as to be blessed with children, let him live on such terms of intimacy with them, that they shall regard him as their companion and confidant. It is a shame for a parent to be so distant and unsympathizing, that his children find his presence a constraint upon their freedom of feeling or action. The step of a father at the door is sometimes equivalent to "Hush, be still." It ought to be a signal for the beginning of better sport. A sad and unnatural state of things exists in that household, where the entrance of the father brings a cloud to darken the faces of his children in stead of

more sunshine to increase their gladness. Both parent and children are great losers unless there be an entire freedom of intercourse and familiarity between them. He is a loser, in respect to their affections and confidence, and that sweet healthful joy, that flows from their unembarrassed society, and which is like the morning dew in its power of refreshing the heart. They, on the other hand, are losers in not having the benefit of his presence and counsels to keep them from excess and wrong, and to guide their sports to good and useful ends. In short, he misses the chief blessing of having children, and they what is the best part of a father.

Another direction of equal importance with the one just given, is to keep up our youthful studies. If we mistake not, men do not more incline to grow away from the young in their feelings, than in their intellectual qualities. That is, age not only may unfit them for being agreeable companions, but also for being successful and interesting instructors of the young. As life advances, especially in the case of those whose pursuits are intellectual, it develops a fondness for abstract reasoning and the severe forms of thought, with a corresponding disregard of what is concrete and imaginative. Along with this change, and to a great degree causing it, is a change in the studies pursued. They are almost entirely professional, or such as relate to one's chosen vocation, to the total exclusion of general literature. Poetry, history, and art, those studies which excite the imagination and quicken the heart of youth, are gradually thrown aside for such as require the exercise of the "dry light of reason" only. The style of composition indicates the change. It is more severe and unadorned, less lively and interesting in itself. It may be a more perfect medium of thought, according to the principles of true art, which holds that style, like the atmosphere, is best when most transparent, revealing clearly the objects that lie in it, while itself invisible. But the product, taking substance and style together, is not likely to be attractive to the young, or to the generality of men. When a preacher comes to this, he will cease to interest the imaginative and emotional, though he should retain his place with those that are strong-headed and fond of dry thinking. Doubtless there are to be found some in

almost every congregation, and those the foremost in intellectual power perhaps, who will value this style of writing and address ; but the majority will pronounce it dull, and wish for something different.

Now the problem is, how shall a man keep young in mind, as well as in heart, or retain the attractiveness of his youthful style, without sacrificing anything that is valuable in maturity. Is it not possible to grow old, developing the ripe fruits of study and culture, strength, depth and clearness, without losing those qualities of thought and expression, which are so pleasing to the young and imaginative? Can not strong reasoning and deep thought be joined to youthful vivacity and modes of illustration, in such a way as to interest all? Must one necessarily be dull in dealing with abstract ideas? Can they not be touched by imagination as with a sunbeam, so as to be radiant with light and beauty, which shall make them both intelligible and attractive? Must we suppose that the higher faculties of the mind can exist only after imagination and feeling have perished ; that they are like autumn fruit, which succeeds the blossom of spring, and waits till they wither and fall before it begins to appear? No. We rather regard the mind as like a tropical tree, where fruit and blossoms appear side by side, and the whole circle of growth remains always visible. The way to realize this conception we believe to be, by keeping up those general studies, in which we early delighted, or by cultivating them now, if no such fondness ever existed. They develop a symmetrical nature, and counteract that narrowness or one-sidedness, which results from an exclusive attention to one particular line of thought. A man's professional studies, if allowed to engross him wholly, will have a similar effect upon his mind, to that produced upon the mechanic who allows himself no other exercise than what he finds in his trade. The blacksmith, for instance, may thus acquire great muscular strength in his arms, but by the same means grows awkward and clumsy. What practice in the various exercises of the gymnasium will do in the way of giving symmetry of form and quickness of action and grace of motion, general culture will do for the professional man.

Let the taste for poetry and general literature be, therefore,

diligently cultivated and preserved, and not neglected. Here is a kind of common ground for all ages, where every one may find something that is congenial to him. As such let the professional man view it, and hold on to it. He whose mind is familiar with it, speaks a language which all to some extent can understand, and his discourse will never be entirely devoid of interest to any. Let the acquaintance be extended to new authors, if familiarity should make one tired of the old; but let not the field be abandoned. Somewhere in it, the feet should be accustomed often to tread.

The knowledge of the ancient classics, studied in youth, should be also preserved. It is wrong to neglect them, as many do, so that a few years after school life or college life is ended, they be so rusty from disuse, as to be unintelligible without a lexicon. They are a fountain of perennial freshness, which should not be allowed to become choked with rubbish and the dust of oblivion. He who is accustomed to drink lovingly and often from it acquires a charm of style that never wearies. The richest portion of modern literature has been inspired by it, or grown out of it, like a beautiful tree from a long buried root revived. The literature of the middle ages was a desert made up of monkish folly and the wily speculations of the schoolmen; it presents a dreary and uninteresting expanse relieved by scarcely one spot of greenness. It was the revival of classical studies, that put an end to the dismal scene. They acted as a fertilizer, changing a waste of sand into a beautiful field. Their operation upon the individual, is similar to what it then was upon the world. They redeem thought from heaviness, dullness, and inanity. When the heart has grown "dry as summer's dust," they moisten and quicken it.

If a man will give to himself such a liberal culture, and maintain, as we have indicated, the studies which delight in general our youth, he will not be likely to lose his early freshness, or grow incapable of giving an attraction to his instructions. The old charm will remain to give greater effect to the powers which maturity develops. Many examples might be cited in proof. But a happy instance is at hand, in the case of one of the most able and successful ministers in the country, who has been pastor of a metropolitan church for a



score of years, and is more beloved and admired by his people today than ever before. Time has neither withered his faculties of youth, nor the garland of affectionate esteem with which he has been crowned. It was only a few weeks ago that an article appeared in a religious journal from his pen entitled "Notes from the Home Library;" in which he discusses, to the delight of his readers, the books that lay as familiar companions on his table. These were the names of the authors: Dante, Michael Angelo, Shakespeare and Mendelssohn. Seeing them, we learn the secret of his prolonged popularity, or how time has not made him dull. We behold him here regaling himself in the fields of Poetry, Art and Music. These, by no means, mark the extent of his accomplishments. We have heard that he is one of the best Egyptologists in the land, and an eager student of all sorts of knowledge; and this, without neglecting in the least the just claims of his profession.

But, notwithstanding this fine example of what may be done in general literaturé by a professional man, many persons upon receiving the recommendation which we give, will answer that they have no time wherein to carry it into effect. Labors purely professional draw so heavily upon them, that they have room for nothing else. No doubt this plea would be sincerely offered on the part of some, and however glad they might be to refresh their minds with such studies, they are held back, as by a chain, by believing that they can find no time for them. What reply shall be given to these? Must they acquiesce in their fate, concluding that, in their case, sprightliness of mind and imaginative grace must perish, and there is no help for it? Let those who complain that they have not time for such pursuits, make time. There are two ways in which this wonder may be achieved.

One is, by using method in the adjustment of our work. Method bears the same relation to time, that good packing does to space. If a good packer can put twice as much, and in better shape, in any given room, as he can who crams his things in at hap-hazard, so a man, who works by method, will, as a rule, crowd into a day more labor, that shall be better done, than one who works with no system.

We all have had something like a verification of this in our

own experience. We occasionally come to days when we find it necessary to do double the work that we do on ordinary days. Being aware, beforehand, of the exigency, we calculate how it is to be met. A plan is formed, according to which the work is distributed. Every hour has so much allotted to it, which must be performed in it, without failure. By this methodical arrangement, we are kept from loitering. No time is lost. Our course through the day is rapid and skillful, and no matter how great the amount of work imposed, we accomplish it. By adopting such a methodical habit, we can probably do all the professional work we desire to do, if living without it, and have large room for those general studies, which have been recommended.

Again, we can make time for such studies by a careful husbandry of the fragments of time. A great deal may be accomplished by one who allows no waste of leisure, however small; who is diligent to fill it up by eager snatches at a book kept ready at hand for such opportunities.

Macaulay speaks of a beautiful painted window in Lincoln Cathedral, which was made by an apprentice, of the bits of colored glass that had been rejected by his master, and which is far superior to every other window in the building. There is no doubt but that a similar marvel might be wrought by many a man, if only more careful how he used the little bits of spare time which are heedlessly thrown away. Certainly, an acquaintance with literature could thus be formed, and culture be obtained, which would shed a rich, mellow light over professional labors, like that of a stained window upon the stony floor of a cathedral. We wrongly think, when a few moments of vacancy occur, that nothing can be done with intervals so small. If we go to our usual work we shall no sooner be seated to begin it, than we shall be called off from it. Therefore, the moments are idled away; whereas, were a book at hand, we might read a few lines of a poem, a page of an essay, or at least draw from some source, a thought which should both enrich the mind and refresh it when over-wearied by its regular toil.

This suggests another thing. A portion of that time which we think necessary for recreation, may be given to such pur-

suits. It is not necessary to be idle in order to rest, or to cease from mental occupation to refresh the mind. Change of work is itself a rest. Especially, where the mind has become jaded with hard professional study, is it a rest to turn to these other studies. The truth of this is attested by many witnesses.

We shall cite the testimony of but one, that of the late F. W. Robertson, who, whatever errors of religious speculation may be charged against him, was a man of remarkable mental vigor and freshness :

"I know what it is, to have had to toil when the brain was throbbing the mind incapable of originating a thought, and the body worn and sore with exhaustion, and I know what it is in such an hour to take down my Sophocles, or my Plato, my Goethe or my Dante, Shakespeare, Wordsworth or Tennyson, and then to feel the jar of nerve gradually cease, and the darkness in which all life had robed itself to the imagination, become light, discord pass into harmony, and physical exhaustion rise by degrees into a consciousness of power."

If now it should strangely happen that these directions for making time were to fail, and no space could be secured, notwithstanding, for those studies of rejuvenating influence, that have been commended, we should give as a final direction, "Take the time." We must remember that unless we can obtain the ears of men and interest them in our teachings, our professional acquirements are vain. Better is it, therefore, to pursue a course of study that shall give us ready listeners, though not so deeply read in professional lore, as were otherwise desirable, than to be in all points perfectly read at the expense of such advantage. Let us not be understood as disparaging in the least professional learning, and least of all, the importance of theological learning to the minister of the Gospel. We certainly owe this debt to our profession, that we should be willing to devote to the study of its literature, the best part of our time and energies. We are only pleading for as much of these reserved to other and more general studies, as shall make our professional knowledge of avail to us. We would have the channel of communication cared for though the fountain be not so full, rather than have the fountain full, and that channel destroyed.

But who believes that the fountain will run low in consequence of occasional attention given to general literature, in the case of a conscientious man! Take the Christian pastor. Will any one pretend that he can not become well read in the literature of his profession without an entire and exclusive engagement with it; or that every hour, diverted from it, is sure to make a flaw in the completeness of his acquaintance with it? If any man thinks so, he reckons as essential what is unessential, and places an undue value upon things of little moment. It is by no means a man's duty to master every thing, in the shape of discussion and formal treatise, that has ever been written upon theological questions. If we thought so, we should be appalled by the mighty labor. It would weigh upon us like Etna upon Enceladus, and we could not begin to stir it. It is important, for example, to be acquainted with the historical development of religious doctrines. But why need we consider it indispensable, to read every controversy that has arisen in the course of that development; to look into every theological tilt that has ever happened and add our voices to those, which in his generation, proclaimed the triumph of the victor? We can fit ourselves to become able teachers of the truth without it, and pursue studies that shall do incomparably more for us in the way of enriching the mind and quickening thought. This is reason sufficient, for leaving the dry bones of the past undisturbed in their burial-places, and busying ourselves with truths that are always young and forever living.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE RESERVED FORCE IN THE SCRIPTURES AND A PLEA FOR THEIR STUDY.

THE age in which we live is practical. The hearts of men are eagerly set upon results. The days of dreamy speculation, of poetic or religious contemplation, seem to have passed by. To act, rather than to think; to act with reference to an end soon and certainly attainable; rather than to strive after ab-

abstract and shadowy ideas of truth or perfection, this is the rule of life everywhere. And, in immediate connection with this pervading sentiment, great and beneficent changes have been accomplished, and the world has grown, in a certain sense, wider and happier. More room is being made in it, all the time, for the poor and the oppressed, while the comforts and conveniences of life are placed within the reach of a far larger number of the earth's inhabitants than ever before. How many of the great forces of nature have lately been tamed and made serviceable ! How many long understood, but long neglected principles of science have been made to receive some useful application ! How much of the long waste of material resources, that has been going on for ages, has at length ceased ! It is as though humanity had shut up its books and were putting to the proof, in good earnest, the maxims of wisdom stored up in the progress of so many centuries ; just as the individual, after his season of preparation in the school or the college, steps forth into active life, and brings his painfully acquired learning to the test of a daily experience in the practice of some useful profession.

It is not strange that, in such an age, there should be a tendency to undervalue books and study. And yet in this tendency there lies a great danger. It still continues to be true, in the words of the great founder of modern practical science that "knowledge is power." And if there did not lie, back of the mighty energies put forth today, that vast sum of accumulated wisdom descending to us from the past, by which they are vitalized and controlled, all would be wasted and lost, for want of a certain direction. Rather they had never been put forth at all, for the inspiration which called them into exercise had been lacking. There is, indeed, little danger that the material sciences will suffer neglect from any mistake here, for men are comparatively wise where their material interests are concerned. It is in the department of our higher needs that we are most apt to be bewildered and run astray, because, in most men, their presence is less sensibly felt, and their demands are more easily granted. The interest in them, even in those who are very earnest, is less simple and entire, and the liability to deception is, therefore, much greater.

Benevolent enterprise has, in harmony with the general spirit of the age, sprung into a new and hitherto unparalleled activity. The command, "go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," has rung in the ears of believers with a new meaning. An earnest conscientiousness impels to the fulfilment of external duty in every sphere, whether extensive or narrow, while the second commandment of the two is apparently receiving an attention equalling, and in some instances supplanting, that bestowed upon the first. The religious life of the previous period was, to a great extent, introspective. That of the present looks forth into the world without, to see what may be done there, and to do it. The Christian mind of the past centuries thought deeply into the truth, divided, and distinguished, formed creeds and systems of doctrine. It was profoundly reflective and serious in its character. That of our own time is satisfied to behold truth rather in its moral than in its intellectual aspects, and is far more anxious to secure the spirit of Christian love, than the form of Christian doctrine. The danger accompanying the former tendency, "a danger not escaped," was that of a cold and oppressive dogmatism; but out of the latter also can come an evil fruit, a frivolous superficiality, first seen in the belief, and then acted forth in the life, an easy indifference to the truth for its own sake, which can never exist without peril to all pure and elevated principles of action. Carried to their worst extremes these two opposing tendencies leave us to choose between those two hollow unrealities, the inspiring sources of all hypocrisies, faith without works, and works without faith.

But, to look upon the more hopeful side of our present tendencies, so far as the earnestness which seems to characterize the time is sincere, and much of it is so, it is also thoughtful; and where it is really thoughtful the necessity is felt of falling back ever and again upon the great original sources of wisdom, whatever they may be, and however they may be accessible. The experience of the individual, or even of the generation, is seen to be insufficient for the best guidance, under all exigencies. The wisdom that is laid up of old time, in treasure houses, and handed down to us as a vast inheritance from the ages gone by, this will not be neglected nor forgotten, even in

this era of active work: rather it will be resorted to with eagerness. The past will be made to throw its full light upon the present, and the best workers of the present will know that the activity of the hands and of the heart is not enough, but that the higher intellectual and spiritual faculties must also be put into exercise, that what is done may be so done as to secure the highest and most lasting results. Great has been the rivalry between the thinker and the man of action, but in truth, each needs the other. Indeed the best and most efficient worker is he who unites in himself the characteristics of both. Knowledge directs experiment, and experiment vitalizes and increases knowledge. The man, whose mind is thoroughly and constantly replenished by study and thought, has within himself the answers to a thousand questions that arise in the progress of every human pursuit, and he knows where to turn for as many more, in time of need.

Against mere learning, indeed, it is not strange that a prejudice should have arisen, so much of human selfishness has operated in its acquisition hitherto; so many have been willing to lay it up, as misers do their wealth, counting over their hoarded stores with secret exultation, now and then, but never bringing forth any of it in the affectionate and helpful spirit that might have made it a blessing to their race. The stores of the miser remain when his bones are mouldering in the dust, and his heirs are the richer, if not the happier, for their possession, but these too often decay with their owners, and no heirs by cunning search or happy discovery, can avail themselves of the useless treasure. The wretched spirit of pedantry, again, has misused learning for its vain and unadmired displays, procuring to itself sometimes the wondering gaze of ignorance, but from the more intelligent portion of mankind only a well merited contempt. The ostentatious parade of wealth is always an annoyance and an insult, but the man who unfolds his mental acquisitions for the mere sake of pride and vain glory, seldom secures even the poor flattery of envy, and the odium which rightly belongs only to his mode of exhibiting his possessions is apt, most unjustly, to attach itself to those possessions themselves.

But there are examples of a different kind, amply sufficient



to show how much a man, by the careful culture of his mental powers, by making his own, so far as possible, the best thought and experience of the race, especially as it may serve to illumine that sphere of action which he has chosen as the scene of his own usefulness, may multiply his power to aid and benefit others.

A book is a dead and inert thing to look at, and dead enough it is, as it stands, covered with cobwebs and dust, on the shelves of a library. And yet, out of some of these musty leaves what a mighty energy has at times gone forth. Between them was imprisoned a living spark, which fell at last into some mind all prepared to be kindled by it, and straightway there arose a flame that illumed the whole horizon, and half the world. There are some books whose power over men seems never likely to fail. They are as fresh now, as true to nature, and to humanity, as they appeared on the day when they were written, and the great masters and leaders of the race will always resort to them for their best and most effective culture.

Such a book, but far more wonderful, than any of the rest, is the best earthly possession of the Christian church, the charter and guaranty of her rights, her liberties, her hopes, the strongest weapon of her defence, the surest instrument of her future victory.

That a great power is contained within the pages of the Bible may be inferred from its records in the past. The nucleus from which its course began is found away back in the earliest ages of the world. No other literature compares with it in well ascertained antiquity of origin, and yet, at this present day, no other book, or collection of books, is so fresh to the mind of the age, so widely read, so deeply pondered, so universally accepted and loved. Committed for more than a thousand years to the safe keeping of a race, the narrowest and most exclusive of mankind, a race that grew into existence as a nation under the oppressive and degrading yoke of slavery, and which was always obscurely and imperfectly known beyond the borders of its own territory; consisting, too, in great part of the historic and biographic records of such a nation as this, it has come to be, somehow, the book of the world; for the vast

multitudes of those who have welcomed and adopted it as their law, their comfort, and their life, is made up from tribes and tongues almost without number. And every civilized people on earth has more or less openly acknowledged its teachings, as the great source of a sure prosperity, as the strongest foundation of a true and faithful national life.

And within the limits of the Christian church itself, a society established upon the doctrines of this book as its basis, we find a still stronger testimony to the mighty forces stored up and latent in its pages. Those periods of the church's history in which it has shown the greatest likeness to Jesus Christ, its founder and head, when it has produced the greatest impression, and extended its influence most rapidly on the world, have been periods of deep and earnest study of the Scriptures. Whenever, on the other hand, she has been most corrupt and unlike her Master, most weak and uninfluential for good, the Bible has been far away, out of her sight, and for purposes of continual guidance and illumination, to most of her children, as if it were not. If there is any truth which it is the mission of the church to bear before the world, to exhibit by living example, and enforce by constant testimony, that truth flows to her forever living, pure, and unadulterated, out of these sacred pages. All that she has of beauty, of strength, of renovating power, may be traced back in some way to what is contained for her here.

Who will deny any of these things? Yet who will receive the inferences that may be fairly drawn from these undoubted truths? It is acknowledged throughout the greater part of the Protestant church, that the knowledge of the Bible should be as widely and thoroughly diffused as possible. Indeed she has distinctly proposed to herself this grand problem, to institute and to maintain a constant and active circulation of the Scriptures throughout the bounds of the habitable world, a noble scheme, and one which has already accomplished glorious results. And what thoughtful believer does not feel it to be something for which he would even sacrifice life itself, to have the Bible in the hands of all men. Who would part with his own right in it, his own opportunities of consulting these oracles of salvation, for all else that the world can offer? But

where is he who makes that use of these precious opportunities which even his own lowest estimate declares to be fitting and needful? Are there even any, who, when they consider what this book contains for us, and what that constant and thoughtful use of it must be, that shall cause it to unfold its deepest treasures, will profess to have worked this mine hitherto, with that zeal and wisdom and earnestness which has caused it to yield to them all along, the utmost of its wealth that their own abilities and advantages would enable them to secure. By looking to see what neglect the Bible has suffered at the hands of its greatest lovers, we may infer how far it had fallen short of producing its fullest effect even upon the Christian church, and if it has done so much, while so misused and overlooked, what might we not expect from its thorough diffusion and faithful perusal throughout the various nations of mankind? What happy results might we not predict, if only those who profess to be guided by its precepts were in the daily habit of giving it some measure of that thoughtful attention which they bestow upon their farms, their accounts, or the routine of household duty?

But something more than this is needed, even demanded, unless the church, which God has founded upon earth, is to be terribly shaken, and to suffer as she has not suffered hitherto in the great flood of worldliness that is now beating up against her foundations and threatening her destruction. In some respects the prospects of Christ's kingdom are bright and even glorious. The mighty hand of God is ever and anon interposed, so obviously directing its course, and preparing the way before it, that no believing heart can doubt that he will eventually cause it to triumph over all its foes. But mean time the great battle is still raging, and sometimes the army of the cross is driven backward, and sometimes it suffers terrible defeat and loss. At times it is almost overwhelmed by the onrushing tide of its foes. And just at the present crisis, those who look forth among the actual signs of the times see so much that is dark and threatening, that if there were not one sure confidence to rest upon, namely, that God knows and directs all, and will never forget the glory of his own most holy name nor the cause for which his Son both lived and died, they

would be ready to sink in despair. These gloomy tokens are so well known to most of those who watch the indications of Providence that it is not necessary to enumerate them here. It is sufficient to remark that while our Saviour doubtless calls on all his disciples watchfully to note all indications that make the position of the church in the age in which we individually live, it is not that our courage may sink or rise as their omens look unfavorable or fair, but that we may wisely acquit ourselves with reference to the real condition of affairs, and meet each emergency, as it arises, with just that course of action which it requires.

Now is surely the time, if ever, in the history of the world, that the faith of the church should be reinforced and strengthened, and her knowledge of the truths increased by communion with those inspired sources which contain so much of God's message to the world, that one name is applied to them and to him, who was in his own person the "Word of God" to man. Too much time, too earnest study, can hardly be expended here. True it is that the sacredness which breathes from every page of the holy record, the spirit of love which beautifies it throughout, the whole impress of a divine origin, can not fail of producing their effect, even upon the most careless reader, and so many are conscious of having derived great benefit from the mere contact afforded in the most disconnected and superficial perusal, that some have been ready to doubt whether any thing more is necessary or even desirable. Something of that sacred fear which the Jews of old attached to their holy things, lingers about the Word of God. Very far into that "holy of holies" it seems sacrilege to attempt to penetrate. Nor is the blessing altogether missed, even so unappreciated, when this reverence is sincere. For the divine mercy has so planned that he who runs may read. The gift was made to those whose condition was desperate, but whose desire after the truth that will save them is so small, that if the essential part of the message is not plainly and simply declared, and easily comprehended, it will all too seldom be sought after. And yet the command to "search the Scriptures" has its deep significance, and, if obeyed, brings great rewards.

Many a minister of the Gospel has wondered and lamented

over his imperfect success in proclaiming these good tidings of salvation, whose mistake has lain, in part at least, just here. Armed with a tolerably clear knowledge of the great truths that the Bible contains, full of zeal for the conversion of souls, ready to make any sacrifice for the cause of his Master, pleading often and earnestly with God to bless his ministry and make it fruitful, and, as to his Bible itself, perusing it daily with the loving and confiding spirit of a child listening to the instructions of its mother, his sermons are yet lacking in true vigor, in spiritual power. They fail to secure the steady attention of his audience. The impression made by them is general, and there is a sameness in their contents and tone from Sabbath to Sabbath, which at last wearies. Gradually, perhaps, one hearer after another ceases to attend upon the preaching; the church begins to think it time to have a change; and the pastor himself suspects, with only too painful a sense of certainty, that his usefulness is waning, and that it is time for him to seek another field.

We may suppose such a man to have formed his theory of sermonizing, partly from his observation of failures in entirely an opposite direction. The highly wrought and artificial method of discourse, he has observed, attracts admiration oftener than it leads to a change of resolution. He has himself experienced the effect upon his own mind of that strained and excited attention called forth by the finished and elaborate efforts of some of the "great preachers" of the day, and the after reaction and the sense of weariness which often follows, when the mind gropes about in vain for some one solid and valuable idea on which to dwell. He has concluded that these "ambitious" flights, so he has perhaps too uncharitably stigmatized them, have their own reward, but not the one he is seeking, and has resolved to avoid any imitation of such a style of sermonizing with the utmost care. And he is doubtless right in so far that no appeal made and applied by dry intellect alone, can very deeply touch the heart. But neither can the mere affectionate pleading of a loving heart effect very much, unless enforced with all the energy of a freshly invigorated understanding, and all the authority that argument and reason can supply. With men we must deal as men, considering human

nature in its entire constitution, and in its enforced variety of wants, not making the grace of God of more effect in this way, but remembering that since that grace makes use of human instruments to effect its ends, it will doubtless employ and honor all human faculties for this purpose; not the intellect alone, not the heart alone, but intellect and heart in strong and happy union, each doubly serviceable because supported and aided by the other.

The Bible itself, the "word" as in truth it is, is the mirror of what the preacher should be, the model of all other words which are to draw men to Christ: The few truths necessary to salvation are there presented in an endless variety of modes and forms, so that, if possible, in some way, men may be attracted out of every age and nation, that even each separate individuality of character may there find something corresponding to its peculiar needs. From the one living and vigorous root spring many branches and ramifications; each with its own burthen of leaves and flowers and fruit, each fresh and beautiful, and full of life, because of its communication with the common root. Those who first uttered the words of power had their understandings illumined, and their souls replenished, by direct communication with the great original source of light and life, but the preacher must receive that light through their aid, and with a more conscious, voluntary effort of his own faculties, than was theirs. Every day he needs to obtain a new supply through this unfailing medium, which is constructed to satisfy the world's need so long as it shall stand. And if, on arising from that study of its pages with which he is accustomed to satisfy himself, he finds that he has obtained no new and deep view of some portion of God's truth, no vivid impression, at least, unfelt before, he may be sure that his study has been insufficient. He can convey no more to his people than he has himself received. He will continue to resemble the unskilled player on an instrument, the few monotonous changes in whose music only tire the ears of the listeners, while the practised master knows how to draw from the very same chords a multitudinous harmony on which the memory lingers long after it is still.

Should this same student of Scripture habitually so linger

over his task, that he never willingly stops short of a clear understanding, even to the minutest detail, if it be possible, of those passages that come under his consideration, while he strives at the same time to seize upon their profoundest sense, and their widest relations, making use to this end of the most thorough analysis and comparison, the most careful scrutiny of the original text; should he ever set himself about his work with such deliberation and earnest purpose, feeling that it is a work indeed as well as a delight, that he has humbly and with great desire implored the aid of him who gave this gift to man, that he may receive and be prepared to impart it rightly, should he thus constantly place himself in a position to drink into the very spirit of that letter he investigates, rarely, indeed, in such a case will he rise from his labor unenriched with treasures new and old, a wealth of which those to whom he ministers will not be unaware, which will perhaps enrich them also, to their eternal gain.

The minister who is in the habit of thus preparing himself for his duty will seldom find room in his discourses for the more commonplaces current at the hour, nor will many of his own expressions become stereotyped by repetition. When the mind is full of a subject, and by steady and mature consideration has at length arrived at a clear conception of it, each fresh and living thought, as it unfolds itself, receives from the mind itself its fitting and natural form of expression, whose distinctness and individuality will correspond to the measure of those qualities in the thought that is to be expressed. The intellectual energies of some men operate with great spontaneity. Such men reflect and reason rapidly; and they have the power of concentrating their attention on objects with very little difficulty, so as to form a decided conception of them almost at once. The words of such men always carry force. They are not vague, nor commonplace, but convey ever some novel and vivid impression to the hearer's mind. This facility of thought and expression is a gift akin to genius, and if not counterbalanced by some great defect, makes a speaker popular and effective. But what is natural in a few, must be attained with careful effect by others. The clearness, the distinct and bright relief which belongs to a good style of oratory can well be



dispensed with by the preacher. And he is almost happy in his want of natural readiness of mind, who is compelled by it to a deeper and more earnest contemplation of the truth he wishes to recommend. The conceptions he produces will be less various, less manifold, for a time, less delightful by their sparkling brilliancy than those which flow from a mind more kindly endowed by nature, but they may be far more profound, lie far closer to the truth, and bear the test of a longer and closer scrutiny. Nor will they fail of a native beauty and attractiveness of their own, unless some wrong theory of discourse, or some decided mental or moral defect come in to mar and impede their spontaneous development into expression.

But there is yet another mode of biblical study which is only less important than that already indicated, namely, the critical. The audacious freedom with which this method has been employed by the enemies of revelation has associated its use somewhat with unbelief or scepticism. There exists in the heart of the reverent and loving disciple that natural reluctance which all men feel to see the object of their deepest affection and awe scanned and commented upon by those to whom their sentiment is the object of aversion or ridicule. With him to give up the Bible would be to give up life itself. Hence the natural shrinking and hesitation with which he approaches a mode of investigation, that seems to imply a possible doubt as to the truth of its contents. But this mere nervous timidity, when it does not arise from a wise distrust of one's own acuteness in detecting sophism, implies after all, a want of faith in the truth, especially if found in the hearts of any who are bound to be her earnest champions. It is a triumph on the part of her adversaries, if those who love her can be made to feel that she will not bear to be unveiled. It is at bottom a want of faith that opposes the progress of light in any direction, unless it is something worse, a hatred of the light itself. And most lamentable have been the fruits of this form of infidelity in former ages of the church, as we all can now see. Sad truth it is, and yet most true, that the church has at times so belied her real character as to prove herself hostile to the progress of discovery, and the dissemination of knowledge. The tendency is one always existing to a greater or less degree.

and arises from the peculiarity of her position, but only becomes actual as the element of worldliness and unbelief which still exists within her, by reason of the "Old Adam" not yet dead, even in the hearts of her true children, obtains in any degree preponderance and control.

Another reason indeed sometimes exists for that indifference to a profound investigation of truth, which to so great an extent prevails, namely a sort of quiescent confidence in her eventual triumph, and a most unwise contempt meantime of her adversaries, and their resources. Some of our mistakes during the late war might teach us a useful lesson here, namely, that it is never well to undervalue our opponents, nor to reckon their means of assault and defence as less than they really are. The truth indeed is mightier than all, but that is no reason why we should sit down indolent and listless under her banner. Whatever her victories, our share in them will so at any rate be small. And who can tell how much her final triumph is thus delayed.

The Gentile church, the church of the nations, is a different thing from the Jewish root out of which she sprung. The culture of the Jew was narrow. It was his office jealously to guard the ark of God, which, closed and veiled, reposed under the wings of the seraphim, until the ages were ready for its opening. But the time came at last; the mysteries of God were made known to the world, now ripe and waiting for the news of salvation. To men of all races, of all forms of character and culture, the precious gift is given, which promised at first to be only the inheritance of a particular people. And the man who was chosen to disseminate the knowledge of the boon, was one uniting in himself the characteristics and culture of many nations, a man who did not shrink from adapting himself to the wants and demands of all, a man who was ready to recognize in humanity all that he found there of divine origin, and who could gladly make use of any gleam of truth which he found still lingering among the darkened tribes of men, as a means of leading them towards the perfect light. A like mission with that of Paul is committed to all his successors. The Bible is for all times, and all peoples; not for the savage, the barbarian alone; not only for the ignorant and uncultivated, but for nations the most enlightened and civilized, and at their

highest periods of refinement and culture. How then can it be too thoroughly known by those who would commend it to the world? How can it refuse the keenest questioning, the most unsparing criticism on the part of those who regard it with hostility? Rather how can it escape these things? And what fear, even if it be so? Rather, is it not well? Doubtless it is well, both for the church herself, and also for her influence among men.

There are some forms which criticism must needs take, that to a mind not yet fortified by faith, yet wishing to believe, must have moments of pain, and even of danger. The only safety in such cases is retreat. To go unarmed into the midst of enemies is ever unwise. *Fides præcedit intellectum* is a maxim of everlasting validity, and no man can reverse this order with impunity. But to the full armed soldier of the cross, the faith that never deserts him even in the midst of seeming reverses is his sufficient safeguard. Sherman, in a letter to Grant, says of the steadfast faith in the success of our cause which accompanied that general from the first, and which Sherman appears to regard as the great secret of his final victory: "I can compare it to nothing but the faith which the Christian has in his Saviour." Let the Christian soldier learn something from this testimony, and cling under all circumstances to that trustworthy shield, wherewith, as Paul declares, he shall be able to resist all the fiery darts of the adversary. Into the bloody and terrible conflict let only those advance who are strong both in native force, and in the possession and use of all those weapons which the Holy Spirit and the Word of God alone can supply.

But there is one direction of criticism so interesting, so fruitful in results, so in harmony with the natural tendencies of the awakened Christian mind, that it needs separate considerations. This is the line of grammatical criticism. In order to its pursuit there is of course implied a knowledge of those tongues in which the Scriptures were originally written. It is strange that the interest in these languages is not, on this very account, more general, strange that a thousand trivial pursuits can so often absorb, to no end but that of loss, the time and attention which might so easily in the case of very many

persons, be employed in the acquisition of at least one of them, that, namely in which the books of the New Testament are handed down to us. Stranger still it is that many who are already provided with such an important means of satisfactory study, should allow it to fall into disuse and neglect. For this knowledge rightly used furnishes answers to a thousand of those questions which arise in the mind of almost every diligent student of Scripture, and which, without it, would never be satisfactorily solved, and is the means of suggesting a thousand more, whose investigation is a source of growth and culture not to be undervalued.

It is true that no translation has ever yet been able to disguise the true spirit of God's Word. The Scriptures, under every garb, proclaim in unmistakable terms the way of salvation. All translations are so far exact, that by means of them not only the heart, but the intellect can grow to wonderful strength and beauty. The deepest and most important problems of theology can be met and solved from them all, because their solution does not depend upon individual texts, but upon the spirit that breathes through the whole. But though the knowledge spoken of is not therefore indeed necessary, it is in many ways advantageous. The nearer we come to the original form in which truth was uttered, the more precise is our apprehension of it. Languages differ greatly in power and mode of expression, and thought, in passing from one to another, always undergoes modification, not always such as affects the substance, or perverts the meaning, but often that which obscures the sense, and renders it difficult of detection. This is particularly true in highly condensed discourses, in close and subtle lines of argument, and in all kinds of writing where the connectives play an important part. The Greek tongue, in which the New Testament is written, is fitted as no other is, for conveying fine and delicate shades of meaning. No other, for example, could have preserved to us so well, and at the same time so compendiously, those precious words of our Saviour contained in the Gospel of John, and it is perhaps only when we read, or rather study them with a long patience in the very words in which they were first delivered to us, that we can entirely apprehend how full, and deep, and inexhaustible in in-

struction and comfort they really are. Something similar is true of the epistles of Paul, many parts of which, that are comparatively plain, and easy to be understood, as he originally wrote them, become, and that almost inevitably, obscure, and sometimes all but unintelligible, when rendered into another tongue.

A quick and active mind that is really interested in the truths of Scripture, but is compelled by ignorance to take them as it were at second hand, must often suppress very earnest cravings for greater certainty as to its real meaning in particular passages or expressions, must still many a question, whose answer would bring light and joy, and bear fruit in praise and thanksgiving to God. This divine truth appears ever the more wonderful, the closer it is seen; other than wonderful it can never appear when seen at all. It is worth time and effort to read and understand the words that Paul and John wrote, nay, almost to hear them speak, as they repeat things uttered in their hearing by the Lord, both while he lived and communed with men on the earth, and after he had ascended into the heavens and sat on the right hand of God. It is worth all it costs to attain one more clue by which to enter into and contemplate the "great mystery of godliness."

And one word as to the real difficulties in the way. A thorough knowledge of the Greek language is indeed a very rare attainment, the reward of hard and persevering endeavor. The same thing may be said, though not perhaps with the same degree of emphasis, of the English, or of any other tongue. And there is, of course, no doubt that the more complete our knowledge of a language is, the better we can understand any particular work contained in it. But a high degree of enjoyment and appreciation is possible where such knowledge is far from exhaustive. This we all know by experience in our own mother tongue. It is on this principle that it is thought expedient in most of the leading Christian denominations, that those who are preparing themselves for the ministry should become somewhat familiar with both the original languages of Scripture, not for the sake of general culture, but that they may be better able to study and to verify for themselves the great truths of the Christian religion. The imperfect and merely prepara-

tory knowledge, obtained in the theological course, rendered more thorough, in the case of the Greek, during a previous period of discipline in classical study, serves as a foundation, to those who are disposed to use their advantages, for wide and deep researches into the letter and spirit of Scripture. Few, hitherto, not actuated by the expectation of becoming public teachers, have begun to study the Greek for the sake of these advantages, but there have been exceptional instances. Among others is related that of a lady to whom we owe in part the introduction of the Sabbath school into New England. She began under disadvantages, it is said, but persevered until her object was attained. Should many others follow her example, it would be a good thing doubtless for the church. We should perhaps have Sabbath school teachers better prepared for their work. Christian knowledge would be on the increase, and we should see, too, it may be hoped, we should certainly see, if these studies were entered upon in that humble and earnest and prayerful spirit which alone can ensure a true success, we should see that there is a close connection between Christian knowledge and Christian life. And the effort necessary would be far less than many suppose. But without effort what good thing can be accomplished? No valuable mental acquisition can be made by any method of study which is unattended with a painstaking and earnest application of the whole mind to the task.

The motives for a profounder and more exhaustive study of the Scriptures, which have thus far been considered, are derived, for the most part, from the position which the church occupies in the midst of her enemies, enemies whom it is her mission, so far as it is possible, to transform into friends. Another set of motives, not less powerful in their nature, is to be found in the idea of Christian culture. The limits due to this article are, however, already overpassed, and the subject deserves to be discussed by itself if discussed at all. It is sufficient for the present merely to point the mind of the reader in this direction, that he may, if he will, consider for himself, what wealth of divine knowledge, what spiritual strength, what joy, springing from an intimate contact with heavenly realities, what perpetual increase of experience and hope, he might reasonably expect to

derive from such continued and faithful investigation of the revealed word as has been thus far contemplated. Let one caution, however, be ever borne in mind, that whatever may be the case with the mere sceptic, the Christian believer must ever approach these pages with reverence, and open them under the guidance of that Spirit by whom they were at first inspired. The Bible is light and life and salvation only to those who seek it as such. To others it is indeed the mere historic record, the mere national literature which they expect and desire to find. It is when we come athirst, that we learn how refreshing these waters are, and the hungry will best know the true taste of this heavenly bread. In nature, in the depths of the human soul, in the written word, God reveals himself to those who seek, and to those that knock, he has said, it shall be opened.

This plea for a more general, more profound, and earnest study of the Bible may well conclude with those warning words of our Saviour, addressed to a class well versed in the sacred history of their own nation, and ready at quoting both law and prophets, when it served their turn, but who with all their knowledge, were yet far enough from entering into the spirit of those holy writings. The words are old, yet ever new: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me."

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### GOD IN VEGETABLE LIFE.

To the devout student of God's operations in the material world, the act of creation never ceases. It is true, that speaking after the manner of men, at the end of six days, whether natural or figurative, the Creator rested from his works. But, that he then left them, as the builder leaves the completed house or edifice, we can not for a single moment entertain the thought. That the countless worlds which he then set in mo-



tion, that the systems which he then arranged, have been wheeling in space for these thousands of years, from the impulse then imparted; that the changes which have transpired among the heavenly bodies have all resulted from the blind physical laws then enacted; that the universe moves on, like a complicated piece of machinery then wound up, and that the great First Cause has since had no personal agency or concern in it, is little better than rank atheism.

A thing created still inheres in the Creator. The same attributes are necessary for its continuance, as its inception. The existence of a thing created, implies the existence, the active existence, of its Creator. Man makes, and leaves what he has made. He puts none of his genius, none of his vital energy, into the structures which he erects. Man dies; but the books he has written, the deeds he has achieved, remain unimpaired. But dependent upon God's being and attributes are all things which he has ever created. They live in God.

Correctly interpreted, therefore, each morning, when the rising sun falls upon the eyelids of a sleeping world, God says, "Let there be light!" and each evening, when the stars appear, the blue vault is lighted up by his omnipotent hand; each spring, when, in the forest, the growing grass begins to lift the dead leaves, the sap courses up through trunk and branch and twig, the buds swell with their tender greenness, and the exiled birds return to their forsaken haunts, God repeats again the old mandate: "Let the earth bring forth grass and herb and tree;" and it is so. The same Being, whose biting frosts lately drove man into his habitation, who lately filled the air and covered the earth with snow crystals, silvered the window-panes, hushed the purling brooks beneath sheeted glass, and flung fetters across the waterfall, now enters another department of his works; invites man forth from behind his double doors and double windows; calls back the sun from his journey to the tropics; warms and quickens the grateful soil, and makes the earth teem with the products of his wisdom and love and power.

In winter, it seems almost as though God had forsaken his works; had allowed the cold stillness of death to pass upon them; had covered them with the pall of death, and left them forever. The fields that lately waved with the golden grain,

and echoed the song of the harvesters, are a desolate waste, bristling with stalks and stubble. Pastures, lately vocal with the lowing herds or bleating flocks, present only trackless acres of white, blank and unbroken. The woods, lately so full of birds, and insects, and the inferior quadrupeds, seem entirely forsaken. But like the sleep of man, the sleep of nature, though similar to death, is not death itself. As soon as God utters his fiat, the slumbering roots begin to perform their suspended offices, the leaves appear as if by magic, and plants and trees are speedily covered with bloom; while every department of his material works, lately so cold and uninviting, overflows with life and beauty.

There is something very wonderful in the endless variety of the products of the soil, even in a single latitude. By what alchemy the same senseless earth can furnish the suitable elements for stalk and leaf and petal; where the different colors are mixed, that tint the foliage and the flower; what are the ingredients of the simplest fragrance, with which our senses are regaled, the wisest man of science would not undertake to tell. But the wonder is infinitely increased, when we pass from latitude to latitude, and discover new varieties of vegetable life, new colors, new fragrance; each adapted to its own locality, and to the wants and happiness of bird and insect, of man and beast.

Vegetation is a perpetual miracle. It is very common for us to speak of vegetable life and growth, as though they were not very remarkable things. We fill a flower-pot with earth, drop in a few seeds, set it in the sunshine, and when the tender spire breaks upward to the light, we do not reflect that this is one of the most marvellous processes in the universe. This very phenomenon of life itself, what is it? It is just as incomprehensible in this plant, as it is in any of us. And who lodged in that dry, unsightly seed, a principle which, under favorable conditions, exhibits this phenomenon? Who legislated for it, determining the conformation and texture of its leaves, the time of its flowering, the shape and shade of its petals, its stamens, and its pistils? And who so guides and controls its development, as progressively to realize the original idea? Out of this little earthen pot that sits in your casement, appears a new cre-

ation, linked backward, indeed, to a previous creation, but to you just as inexplicable as though it were one of the individuals which God first commanded the earth to bring forth.

Magnifiers and telescopes have discovered to us worlds of inquiry in two opposite directions. Through their aid we can count the feet of the centipede, the down of the caterpillar, the particles of gold-dust on the wing of the butterfly. We can count also the rings and satellites of Saturn, and sweep fields of heavenly bodies wholly beyond the reach of the naked eye. But we have sometimes thought that we have around us undiscovered worlds, which we need no powerful glass to penetrate or reveal. The life and growth of a single plant are full of unappreciated mystery and beauty. Here is a vegetable being that feeds itself more unerringly from a soil made up of various different elements, from an atmosphere constantly changing in purity and temperature, than the very creature that God has made in his own image, and constituted an earthly sovereign over all his works. What color of human eye or cheek is like the blue of the violet, the redness of the rose? What skill of human hand, what perfection of human art, has ever equalled the velvet surface of the pansy? What artist has ever put upon canvas such blendings and contrasts, as this vegetable life develops upon every twig and stem? And yet of how many, to whom these sights are so familiar, might it be said, as Wordsworth said of another,

“ A primrose by the river's brim,  
A yellow primrose was to him,  
And it was nothing more”?

To them these vegetable wonders are as so many weeds. There is no mystery or beauty in them. Their language is not of God, his wisdom, his skill, his love.

The Ayreshire ploughman, Burns, found poetry enough to make his name immortal, in the

“ Wee, modest, crimson-tipp'd flower,”

which his rude ploughshare crushed into the rough soil of his native Scotland. And another poet has said :

“ Myriads of daisies have shone forth in flower,  
Near the lark's nest, and in their natural hour,

Have passed away, less happy than the one  
That by the unwilling plough-share died to prove  
The tender charm of poetry and love."

And were it not for the atheism of human nature, and the commonness of such sights, the awakening of the earth in the spring-time, the swelling bud, the blossom, the leaf, the most familiar manifestation of vegetable life, would be a constantly repeated miracle, a perpetual Gospel setting forth afresh and with new emphasis, the attributes of our Maker and Father. We need magnifiers and telescopes, less than a stronger faith. We walk with indifference and insensibility among as great wonders, as we gather into our cabinets from the subterranean vaults beneath us, or discover in the firmament over our heads. We look for God only in the structure that is too intricate for our unaided apprehension and analysis, or too stupendous for our limited powers of achievement; while the very sod beneath our feet throbs with his life, and he carefully compounds every cubic foot of air that we inhale.

A stranger from the Arctic regions, who should listen to a description of the change to be wrought in these latitudes by the advent of spring, would pronounce the statement fabulous; and this, because he had never witnessed anything analogous to it. That the same sun whose oblique rays scarcely visited his native regions, should have power to break the icy fetters of winter, and liberate the earth from her prison-house; that his genial rays could quicken the frozen soil, until it was clothed with greenness, and blossomed in beauty, he would pronounce a thing incredible. But the wonder is none the less, the power to accomplish it, all the greater, because we behold its annual realization. The uniformity with which this great transformation takes place, while to eyes familiar it may decrease its marvellousness, is really one of the elements of marvellousness by which it is distinguished. For twenty, thirty, forty, sixty years, some of us have seen this periodic change pass upon the whole outward world; these unrecognized miracles wrought at our feet. Is God any the less in them? Because in his journey southward, the sun does not transcend the limit of his golden chain, and leave us to unbroken winter; because at the season when seeds must germinate in order to reach maturity in

the autumn, he has sufficiently warmed the dark mould in which they are covered; because during the summer months he mounts still higher, and pours his rays still more directly upon the surface of the earth, until the wheat hangs its head from fullness, and the golden corn reaches maturity, is this any the less a wonder?

The power of manifold reproduction which God imparts to every seed, is no less wonderful than its latent life. It has lodged within itself not only this germ of being, so that upon the fulfillment of certain conditions, it establishes itself in the earth, and appears above the soil, and realizes its law of individual life, but it does not terminate its career, until it has reproduced others and perhaps hundreds of seeds similar to itself. In this arrangement of God's material government, consist the promise and profit of agricultural pursuits. It becomes the aim of the husbandman to surround each seed dropped into the earth with those conditions necessary to realize its greatest fruitfulness. And, therefore, he studies its wants and habits and history. And the single kernel of grain which he buries alone in the spring-time, in the autumn brings forth its thirty, its sixty, its hundred fold.

And when we consider how much of that which is requisite for the sustenance, as well as the occupation, of earth's myriads is dependent upon the successful operation of this single principle of reproduction; how, in order to the preservation and happiness of these millions of men, women and children, not to speak of the cattle that roam a thousand hills, every single seed deposited in the earth must multiply itself many fold; that it is this, and this alone which secures us against actual starvation, then we appreciate how directly the food that we eat comes from the hand of our Heavenly Father. Let our Maker for a single year annul his original legislation; let him separate the connection between the seed sown and the harvest; or let him neutralize man's efforts to provide for it a suitable soil, by changing the character of any one of the seasons, and nothing could avert a famine. This great human family, filling earth's mighty continents, with all the domestic animals dependent upon them, would be destitute of the very commonest necessities of life. In considering such subjects, we are so ac-

customed to stop at second causes ; we are so likely to regard God's methods as laws, which, of themselves, have force and vitality, that we fail to recognize his presence and agency in such a calamitous event. And yet he claims to be the author of famines as well as harvests ; he sends them upon nations in punishment for national sins. A famine visits the inhabitants of Egypt, because the waters of the Nile fail to inundate the surrounding country. A famine occurs in Judea, because of a failure of the early and the latter rain ; or because swarms of locusts and caterpillars destroy the young vegetation. But these are only second causes. God controls these second causes ; gives them their force ; operates through them. And therefore his servants, the prophets, could predict the coming of such judgments ; as Joseph predicted the seven years' famine in Egypt ; as Elijah foretold the drought in Syria.

When the Saviour takes those few loaves and feeds the waiting multitudes, we are astonished at the result, and acknowledge the hand divine. But when, after a few years, we stand in autumn beneath a young tree, which has grown from a single seed dropped in the earth by our own hand, and see it weighed to the ground with delicious fruit, all of which originated in that single seed, it awakens no curiosity, no marvel, no surprise at all ! And yet, we suppose that the same creative power is the source of each of these results. Without God, it is no more within the compass of possibilities, for a seed to produce fruit, containing other seeds, than for a loaf to produce other loaves. The power in the first instance, is just as divine, as it is in the other. We call the one manifestation natural, and the other supernatural ; but they are both alike divine. And to the eye of faith, God annually repeats the miracle of the loaves and the fishes upon a scale infinitely enlarged ; making both the material and the animal worlds reproduce themselves, not merely to feed a few thousands, but to feed the countless nations and tribes and families that swarm over the whole earth. The Saviour came working wonders to prove his heavenly errand, not because there were no wonders daily wrought by the hand of his Father before his advent. The world was full of them. And pointing to the lily of the valley and the fowls of the air, he revealed the use which we are to

make of them. He came working miracles with his own hand, and in his own name, at once to demonstrate that he came forth from the Father, and that he was one with the Father. But, we mistake, if we conclude that the growth of the lily and the tree is any the less divine, because it is so common and because its laws are so regular and well defined.

It is a great misfortune, that scientific studies do not always make reverent men. To philosophize respecting second causes, to study the adaptation of means to ends, seems to materialize the mind. The men that best understand the anatomy of the human body; the men that can best analyze the flower and classify birds, insects, and the lower animals; that are adepts in agricultural chemistry, that are geologists and astronomers, are not always the most devout. And, yet, it should be so. For the footprints of our Maker are planted in the foundations of the earth; he has inscribed all his attributes in the heavens; the inferior tribes of the animal kingdom all speak his wisdom and his skill; every flower that blooms turns to him, and every bird that wings the air is occupied with his praise. And why should not those who make it their life-long study to comprehend these things be equally loyal to their Maker? It is because they rest satisfied with second causes. Nature does not lead them up to nature's God. They stand in the vestibule of her temple. They do not approach the altar dedicated to the living and true God, her author. They admire his works. They do not worship him.

And it is precisely so with the florist and the husbandman. They come at length to look at the soil, the clouds, the rain, the sunshine, and to think little of that Being, whose ministers they are; who makes the sun's rays his pencil, as he tints flower after flower; who opens his windows, when the vernal rain descends upon thirsty fields; and who has established it as his ordinance, to furnish us with seed-time and harvest, summer and winter, cold and heat; who makes the clouds his vesture, and rides upon the wings of the wind.

Traversing the earth, the laboratory and storehouse of God's works, what we most need, is the power of lifting the veil of commonness with which they are hidden. How many a man, whose western window commands such sunsets as would defy



the genius of Claude Lorraine, has spent thousands of dollars to hang his parlor-walls with paintings, of which the most that can be said is, that they are good imitations or reproductions of what is in fact inimitable, of what can not be truly repeated; he admires and patronizes the art of the copyist, while the original of such copies he almost never notices. The sun rises and sets, and he never dreams of remarking the effect of light and shade upon dwelling, tree, hill-top and cloud. But, let the artist arise who can transfer this effect to canvas, and his admiration can find no expression in words.

Precisely so, to appreciate the advent of spring, and the wonder-working power of our Creator in grass and plant and tree, it is not needful to migrate permanently to the country, and surround ourselves with forests and orchards and meadows. A single flower, a single grassy sod, a single tree, may speak to us more emphatically than the country's richest profusion of greenness, foliage and bloom is accustomed to speak to the unreflecting husbandman. We need only the power to notice and appreciate what is passing around us. And if we have this power, even the daisies and buttercups which grow by the wayside, the trees that spread their arching branches over our more favored streets, will be sufficiently eloquent of the wisdom and goodness of our Maker.

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth!" This original mandate of Jehovah has already gone forth again, and the grass, the herb, the tree respond. The earth acknowledges her Maker, and

"Fair-handed Spring unbosoms every grace;  
Throws out the snow-drop, and the crocus first;  
The daisy, primrose, violet darkly blue,  
And polyanthus of unnumbered dyes;  
Anemones, auriculas, enriched  
With shining meal o'er all their velvet leaves;  
And full ranunculus of glowing red."

The sower goes forth, as in the parable, sowing his seed; the gentle rains descend; the pastures are repeopled with flocks and herds;

"Every copse  
 Deep-tangled, tree irregular and bush  
 Bending with dewy moisture, o'er the heads  
 Of the coy choristers that lodge within,  
 Is prodigal of harmony."

And shall man be mute? Shall he fail to recognize his Father's hand? Bowed down by the burdens of life, ensnared in its cares and toils, shall he have no voice of gratitude and praise?

## ARTICLE V.

### AMUSEMENTS.

TRENCH derives the word "amusement" from "a" and "musis," from the Muses, and supposes it to mean the turning off the mind from severer studies to lighter enjoyments.<sup>1</sup> The correctness of this etymology may, however, be doubted. The word would seem to have meant originally something, whether a pleasure or a care, which might lay hold of and engross the mind's attention. The word is not found in the English Bible, though used in the English language, long before our present version of the Scriptures was formed.

The following are some examples of its use among old English writers. Says Fleetwood, in the preface to his "Lay Baptism": "Here I fell into a strong and deep amusement, revolving in my mind, with great perplexity, the amazing change of our affairs." Says Holland, in his translation of Plutarch: "One day Alcibiades knocked at Pericles' door, and answer was made him that he was not at leisure to be spoken with, for that he studied and was amused how to render up his accounts to the Athenians." Says South, in his sermons (Vol. VII, Ser. 1): "Reason would contrive such a religion as should afford both sad and solemn objects to amuse and affect the pensive part of the soul." Says Milton, (*Paradise Lost*, B. VI):

<sup>1</sup> Study of Words, p. 219. In a later book, "Glossary of English Words," etc., p. 4, the author himself objects to this derivation.

“To whom thus Belial, in like gamesome mood ;  
Leader ! the terms we sent were terms of weight,  
Of hard contents, and full of force urged home  
Such as we might perceive amused them all,  
And stumbled many.”

“Being amused,” says Fuller, in his *Church History of Britain*, (B. ix, §44,) “with grief, fear and fright he could not find the house.”

But whatever may have been the original sense of the word, its present meaning is sufficiently clear. Every one understands by it some pleasurable pursuit which engages the mind to the exclusion of laborious or serious occupation. This definition, however, would include recreations, diversions and entertainments as well as amusements, words whose meaning, though similar, is not the same. A recreation is some pleasurable pursuit taken up as a refreshment from business and only enjoyed because the worn and wasted powers become thus recreated, while an amusement is pursued and enjoyed for its own sake and not because it procures anything farther than itself. In recreation we always take some active part, but in amusement we may find our pleasure simply in the passive reception of it. Thus a game of cricket may furnish recreation to the players and amusement to the lookers on. Still farther we are diverted by that which turns off our thoughts to something of livelier interest ; we are entertained by that which brings our minds into agreeable contact with others, as conversation or a book, but our amusement is that which occupies us lightly and pleasantly without reference to any other person or any other end.

It can hardly be doubted that the desire for amusement is natural to the human breast. Everybody has it. The child plays by an original impulse long before he knows anything about work. After he has been taught to labor he still finds greater delight in his sports, and runs to these at every opportunity with tireless interest. The same is true when he becomes a man. At Potsdam, in one of the palaces built and occupied by Frederick the Great, there is still to be seen a grotesque Chinese toy with which the great warrior and king used to amuse himself in moments released from more serious cares. To some it might seem strange that such a man could

ever occupy himself with such a trifle, but, probably, if we could discover the actual facts in any man's experience we should never, even among the most laborious, find a similar disposition entirely wanting.

Is then this desire, thus original and permanent, wholly wrong? Should we treat it like one of the impulses of our self-seeking nature, which we should ever repress and endeavor to extirpate? It is certainly not wrong to desire rest from protracted toil, for God has appointed the Sabbath as a day of rest no less truly than of worship. Moreover, what is our worship when closely and truly considered? Certainly it is not work. Our acts of worship are no means put forth to secure some end beyond themselves. They are themselves an end. Even prayer, in its highest and most satisfying exercises, is not the seeking for some future good, but the enjoyment of a present blessedness. It is most spiritual, most blissful, most heavenly, when the supplication loses itself in adoration. We do not, indeed, call these acts of worship amusements, and yet their deepest element is precisely that absence of all means to a farther end, and that enjoyment of the end in the exercise itself, which we have seen to be the precise quality in amusement. What shall we say then? Is the desire to stop working, the desire to forsake the treadmill, and delight ourselves in what has no constraint of drudgery or toil, an unhallowed longing? But the desire for communion with God is just such a feeling. And so is the desire for anything truly spiritual. In fact the distinction between our natural and our spiritual life is in just this point. Our natural life is a life of toil. In it whatever we do is not for its own sake, but for the sake of something to be thereby gained. We build houses that we may have a home, we toil that we may eat and be clothed, we labor that we may live. Even those processes of our natural life which may be called spontaneous never rest in themselves. We breathe in order to keep up the circulation of the blood; our hearts beat that the course of assimilation and nutrition may continue unimpaired; and while these go forward in order to the preservation and perfecting of our bodily life, the life itself is consciously for the sake of something beyond. We all live for some end other than life. But it is very different when

we enter the realm of our spiritual activity. Here everything has an intrinsic value. Whatsoever is spiritual we prize on its own account and not because it will purchase for us something else. We would sell everything in our natural life, even the life itself for a sufficient price, but can any price be named for our spiritual possessions? Can there be anything more valuable than goodness? And can the worth of truth be more than truth itself?

We sometimes speak of frivolous amusements and the term is doubtless well chosen. How trifling many of them seem! But low as they may be, they reveal glimpses of something truly lofty. Sin itself, with all its degradation, gives us a very powerful impression of the original dignity of a sinning soul. In the very depth of our fall there is evidence of the height from which we came, and which we even now should occupy. The brute can not sin, and is incapable of a fall. The fact of sin, dark as it is, shows us to be possessed of an endowment above the brutes and kindred with the angels. In like manner, even our frivolous amusements disclose a serious aspect of our being. We never speak of the amusements of an animal. What we sometimes call the sportiveness of a kitten or the play of dogs is only the early and instinctive exercise of what will afterward show itself in the pursuit of their prey or their game. They amuse us but not themselves. It is with this as with laughter. The brute does not laugh. He can not. He has not even the muscles requisite for it. The power of laughter, however inane some of its exhibitions may be, bears witness to what is both rational and cultivated. If he is a simpleton who is laughing all the time, we should call him a savage who never laughs at all.

We can not then properly lament the possession of this universal desire for amusement. Neither can we properly seek to repress or to remove it. It belongs to the realm of our spiritual activity. It points us upward, however earthly many of its manifestations may seem. The right treatment of it is to give it a right direction. We can not wish that we had no souls because they have led us to sin and brought upon us unspeakable woe, but we remember that these very souls are as capable of glory as of shame, and instead of the power to annihilate we

seek an influence to redeem, to renew and to perfect them. In like manner we may take this desire for amusement, and recognize not only its divine origin, but, when properly directed, its divine tendency. That in the soul out of which it grows is good, in whatsoever forms of evil it may be clothed.

But what forms of it are evil and how shall they be removed? The answer is not difficult if we keep in view the right aspect of the question. Anything is evil which renders the heart more callous to divine impressions, which benumbs or deadens its sense of goodness, which sunders or separates it from God. But nothing can produce this effect except it be the intention of the heart to have it do so. No outside power ever enters the citadel of the human soul, except as the soul itself first prepares it room and then opens its gates and bids it welcome. We may storm batteries and fortresses, Gibralters or Ehrenbreitsteins may be conquered, but no number of embattled legions can successfully assail the defences of a single soul. It is conquered only by its own chosen submission. It never yields to evil except by its own treachery. "There is nothing from without a man that entering into him can defile him; but the things which come out of him these are they that defile the man." The real evil, the mournful, melancholy thing is not so much in the acts of a man as in the actor himself. The greatest of all wrongs is the intention to do wrong. A man may take the property of another, believing it to be his own, or he may declare a falsehood believing it to be true, and this may be attended with sad consequences to the person defrauded or deceived, but the saddest thing possible in such a case would be the intention to defraud or to deceive.

If there is, therefore, any evil in amusements, it must be found in the evil intention with which they are pursued. They are evil then and only then when they are intended to be so. Now it must be confessed that the action of the heart is very subtle here. It has wondrous skill in hiding its real motives even from its own eyes. It can cover its purposes till it wholly conceals them, or if they must appear, it can clothe them in garments which give them a guise not their own. But we can always test them and reveal them in a true light if we will. If the effect is evil the cause is evil. If any of our

actions bring evil to our souls, it must have been our intention to have them do so, whether we noticed it or not. And if there be any harm in any amusement, the harm must be in some prior tendency of the soul which has sought and found manifestation in this way.

That which is first and most important for us to notice, here as everywhere else, is therefore the state of the heart. "Unto the pure all things are pure; but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure." It is not the acts of an unrenewed man which need changing so much as it is the actor himself. It is not simply a new affection which is needed but a new heart. All moral culture and improvement therefore must aim at a true renovation of soul. If the soul can only be right its actions will be right spontaneously, but so long as it is wrong its deeds will be wrong inevitably. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them."

But it may be asked here: Is not some fruit manifestly evil, and are not some amusements evidently wrong? If we should answer this affirmatively it would come round to the same point again. For, if there were no corrupt tree, there could be no evil fruit, and all wrong amusements with every other wrong thing would disappear if the evil heart were gone. The wrong is nowhere else than in the unrighteous will. Now this unrighteous will can manifest itself either in the prayer meeting or the ball room, and it will assume the one form rather than the other, whenever it can thus best gain its selfish ends.

But is every act then in itself indifferent, and are we to take no heed of anything done, while we look only to the intention of the doer? Are there not some practices against which we must set our faces like a flint? Do not some things have an appearance of evil which we are expressly commanded to avoid? This inquiry can be most clearly answered if put in a different form. In general terms the question amounts to this: Does the action of a man have any reflex effect upon the man himself? Stamped as it is with the moral quality of the



intention, does a good or evil act work back again upon the intention which has produced it with any good or evil power? To this it must be replied that all our moral faculties are strengthened by their every exercise. A man's disposition to steal is stronger from every theft, and any wrong purpose becomes more intense by the wrong deed in which it is executed. Also the fires of devotion are fed by their own flames and every loving heart becomes more loving by loving. It is doubtless, therefore, well to repress some deeds and encourage others. But what deeds? Here again we are to look at the deed in the light of the intention, though perhaps in some instances we can only discover the intention by the deed itself. Anything whereby we become less susceptible to holy impressions reveals a wrong intention, however secret or subtle, and as this intention strengthens itself by its exercise, every exercise which reveals it should cease. Whether balls, theatres, card-playing, etc., are proper amusements, will therefore at once be answered if we notice whether they are pursued with a proper intention, and if there be any doubt respecting this, it can be solved by noticing whether there is thus displayed an increasing zest, or a growing aversion to religious things.

But our best means of repressing wrong amusements will be in cultivating the heart. The baby will give up his rattle and toy of his own accord, when he ceases to be a baby, while no amount of persuasion could lead him to do it before. A man does not play marbles, or trundle his hoop in the street. He did this when a child, and though his growth to manhood may have been slow, yet when he became a man he put away childish things. In like manner, frivolous amusements will be discarded by a soul no longer frivolous.

The quickest and most effective judgment respecting wrong amusements, or any wrong courses, will be gained by the mind most sensitive to right. If its true being and destiny can be kept before it, if it can be filled with thoughts of its great relationship to God and goodness, this will teach it quickly to discriminate between things right and wrong. The mind which has the prevailing consciousness of God and duty will have no trouble to distinguish between good and bad amusements.

We may properly refer here to one of the most noticeable

passages of the Bible, bearing upon this point : "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart and in the sight of thine eyes, but know thou that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." No good reason appears for regarding the former part of this verse as a strain of irony, wherein the sacred Author sarcastically taunts us for the exercise of our original propensities. Rather does it seem to be a divine permission, or perhaps a solemn injunction, to reap the harvest of gladness which we find ready sown and ripened for us in life. There is the command, but as everywhere else, so here, there is the caution too. Rejoice, indeed, and do it heartily, but remember the account to be rendered for it all. Not that the caution makes the command only a mockery, not as though the thought of the coming judgment should destroy every relish for the present joy, but rather that the gladness of this life is to be elevated and hallowed, and set in its due proportions and relationship by the remembrance of the realities and the glories of the life to come. And this is exactly in the line of our argument hitherto. We need the true principle of life to direct us in all the conduct of life. The thought of a coming judgment keeps us constantly watchful of our preparation for it. It need not fill us with dread, for perfect love casteth out fear, and to the true heart nothing is so welcome as a judgment according to truth.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE TRIAL AND CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST.

OVER the greater part of the life of our Saviour there hangs a silence which in vain we seek to break. Even his public ministry, crowded as it was with events the most wonderful, and characterized by words such as man never spake, has come down to us only in fragmentary narratives. Not so imperfect,

however, is the record of the last days of Christ. The story of the trial and crucifixion is told by the sacred writers with a minuteness of detail unusual in the Gospels. The scenes of that painful march from Gethsemane to Calvary are all complete. Even the season of the year is distinctly marked; and we know not only the days of the week on which the several events occurred, but also, in some instances, the very hours of the day. Nor is this all. Many of the characters introduced into the sacred narratives are noticed in contemporary history. Besides, the social, political, and judicial customs, to which reference is made, are explained either by Roman or Jewish writers. To sketch the trial and crucifixion of our Saviour in these different lights, and from these different points of observation, is our purpose in this article.

#### JESUS IN THE HOUSE OF ANNAS.

When the detachment of the Roman cohort, and the officers of the Jews who had been sent by the Sanhedrim to arrest Jesus, had returned to Jerusalem with their prisoner, they led him, as we learn from John, first to Annas. Annas, or Ananus according to Josephus, had, at an earlier period of his life, filled the office of high priest. He received his appointment, A. D. 12, from Quirinus, the imperial governor of Syria; but eleven years after, he was deposed by Valerius Gratus, who on the accession of Nero Tiberius to the throne of the Cæsars, had been made procurator of Judæa. This interference by a Roman official was by no means acceptable to the Jews, who, however degraded politically, were still jealous of their religious rights. It may be, therefore, that Annas, though deprived of his sacred office, continued to be regarded by the Jews themselves as the lawful high priest during the remainder of his life. Certainly he retained the title, and somewhat of the dignity, pertaining to his former station.

Into his presence, before it was yet day, Jesus was brought; Bengel says, "*solum honoris causa*." Wiesler and others suppose that Annas was their Nasi, or President of the Sanhedrim, an office, which, it would seem, was not always filled by the high priest. Lightfoot infers that as "he was the older man, of greater experience and skill in the law," "they desired that

Caiaphas might be directed by his counsel." Friedrich maintains that it was merely in order to allow Caiaphas sufficient time to assemble the Sanhedrim. The explanation of John, however, "for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas," is much more satisfactory than any or all of these. There is here an intimation of a fact which we learn from profane history, when we are told that the ex-high priest exerted a powerful influence over his priestly son-in-law. In all but the title he was indeed still the high priest. Moreover, he had undoubtedly interested himself in no slight degree, in the present attempt to overthrow the growing kingdom of Christ. How natural then, that the motley crowd, which hurried Jesus along the streets of Jerusalem to trial and death, should first halt before the residence of this influential Jew, to assure him of the entire success of their plans by delivering into his hand the prisoner himself?

#### JESUS BEFORE CAIAPHAS.

After a short delay, Jesus was sent to Caiaphas, the high priest and President of the Sanhedrim. Caiaphas, called by Josephus, Joseph Caiaphas, received his appointment to the high priesthood from Valerius Gratus. He continued in office throughout the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, the successor of Valerius, but was removed at the request of the people by the Proconsul Vitellius during his visit to Jerusalem, A. D. 36. He is called by John "high priest of that year." Hug supposes that there were at this time two high priests, Annas and Caiaphas, (Luke iii. 2), and that, by an agreement which they had made, they alternated according to years or festivals. This view, however, is not sustained by Josephus. Lightfoot, on the other hand, finds in these words a reference to the frequent, almost yearly changes at this time in the high priesthood, occasioned by the unwelcome interference of Roman officials; and is of the opinion, as is also Neander, that John introduced this phrase in order to distinguish Caiaphas from Annas, who also bore the title of high priest.

Caiaphas, when informed of the arrest of Jesus, immediately summoned to his palace the members of the Sanhedrim. While they were assembling occurred the preliminary examination by the high priest, which John (xviii. 19—24) alone records.

Then followed, probably as the day began to dawn, the formal arraignment of Jesus before

THE SANHEDRIM.

This was the highest court of judicature among the Jews. It was instituted by Hyrcanus II., but its systematic organization belongs to a later period. The high priest was usually its President, and with him were associated two vice-Presidents. The number of its members was seventy-two. They were of three orders: (1) chief priests, those who had held the office of high priest, together with the heads of the twenty-four classes of priests; (2) elders, who were the princes of tribes, and the heads of distinguished families; (3) scribes, those learned in the laws and customs of the Jews. Not all of the elders and scribes, however, had a seat in the Sanhedrim. This was a privilege which could be secured only by election or royal appointment.

Under the Asmonean princes, in whom both royal and ecclesiastical authority were united, the Sanhedrim exercised jurisdiction in the highest matters, civil and religious, deciding all cases brought before it by appeal from inferior courts, and also exercising a general supervision over the affairs of the nation. It had, moreover, the power of life and death, when free from the Roman yoke.

The place where the Sanhedrim anciently held its deliberations was the hall Gazith, or the stone chamber, which, according to the Talmudists, was in the temple, and east of the most Holy Place.

The seats of the members were so arranged as to form a semi-circle. In the centre sat the Nasi or President, and also the two vice-Presidents. The first vice-President was called the Father of the council, and sat on the right of the President, while the second vice-President sat on the left. Before them, upon a slight elevation, stood the accused with his advocate. If the person brought to trial was acquitted, the verdict was recorded by a scribe who sat on the right of the President; if he was condemned, the sentence was recorded by another scribe, who sat on the left. Near also stood those who were employed to

execute the orders of the court. Besides these **there were** the witnesses for both parties.

The accusation which had been brought against the prisoner was first read by the President. Then followed, in capital cases, the examination of the witnesses for the defence. "In judgments about the life of any," say the laws of the Sanhedrim, "they begin first to transact about quitting the party who is tried; and they begin not with those things which make for his condemnation." The testimony of slaves, minors, and persons of immoral character, was excluded. The concurrent testimony of two witnesses was sufficient to establish the innocence or guilt of the accused. Those found to have borne false witness were visited with penalties according to the magnitude of the case. In capital cases it was death. After the examination of the witnesses, the verdict determined by the vote of the council was declared by the President.

The trial of capital cases began with the day, and ended with the day. If the accused was acquitted, judgment was passed on the same day; but if he was condemned, it was deferred until the day after. The reason of this is thus explained by the old writers: "Blessed is the judge who leaveneth his judgment;" that is they say, "who delays his judgment, and lets it rest all night that he may sift out the truth."

Such was the Sanhedrim in the days of the Jewish commonwealth; but the commonwealth was now no more, and with it had departed the glory of this high tribunal. Its place of assembly was no longer the hall Gazith within the temple, but according to Josephus was on Mount Zion. Its authority and supreme influence was so far diminished that it had ceased to execute its judgments in capital cases, and by many proofs had given evidence that it was in a great decree under the influence of the Roman procurator. Its proceedings, moreover, had lost much of their former regularity.

#### JESUS BEFORE THE SANHEDRIM.

In the palace of Caiaphas, and not in the council chamber, at night, and not in the day as the law required, stands Jesus before the Sanhedrim. No witnesses appear in his behalf; "for the Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that

he was the Christ he should be put out of the synagogue." The witnesses for the prosecution were brought forward, but in their testimony they failed to meet the stern requirements of the Mosaic code. Even the two who had heard Christ speak of the destruction of the Temple are unable to agree. Thus foiled in his design, Caiaphas seeks now to draw from the prisoner himself such a confession as would furnish some ground at least for the sentence, which the Sanhedrim are already impatient to pass. To his words at first the Saviour deigns no reply; but when the high priest, with a solemn adjuration which, according to a Jewish custom, placed the accused himself under the obligations of an oath, asks Jesus, "Art thou the Christ, the son of the Blessed?" he breaks his long silence, and answers "I am!" The members of the Sanhedrim start to their feet in rage. "Art thou," say they all, "the Son of God?" "Ye say that I am," is the Saviour's calmer reply. The whole assembly is at once in an uproar. Rending his princely garments, Caiaphas cries out: "He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses! What think ye?" With a shout they answered, "He is guilty of death!"

The rending of one's garments was in early times a sign expressive of the deepest affliction. Thus we are told that Jacob, when he beheld the blood-stained coat of Joseph, "rent his clothes, and mourned for his son many days." In times of great public distress the same custom was observed. A like ceremony also prevailed among the Romans and the Greeks. So also among the Jews, when one guilty of blasphemy was brought before a court for trial, the judges were accustomed to rend their garments when the blasphemous words were spoken by the witnesses. It was doubtless in accordance with this established usage that Caiaphas rent his priestly robes when with mingled horror and rage he said of Christ: "He has spoken blasphemy."

Of this condemnation of Christ by the Sanhedrim, Bengel pithily remarks: "Moses ait; Blasphemus moriatur. Caiaphas dicit: Jesus est blasphemus. Assessores concludunt: Jesus moriatur."

The trial was now over, but it was not yet day. It has already been seen that according to the Talmudists the trial of



capital cases must begin with the day and end with the day. As it was also required that the sentence should be pronounced within the same limits, Friedlich supposes that the Sanhedrim now adjourned until daylight, in order at least in part to conform to their usual regulations.

Meanwhile occurred that scene of fiendish mockery and cruelty, so briefly and so vividly described by the Evangelists.

As soon as it was day the Sanhedrim reassembled. The sentence of death was now formally pronounced. But here the power of this tribunal ended, unless what had been done should receive the sanction of the Roman procurator. Accordingly it became a question of no slight importance how they might best present the case to him in order to secure the execution of their sentence. At length, their policy determined, "the whole multitude of them," as Luke says, arose and led Jesus unto Pilate.

#### JESUS BEFORE PILATE.

Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judæa, Samaria and Idumæa, was the successor of Valerius Gratus. He received his appointment to this province from the Emperor Tiberius, about the year A. D. 26, and continued in office ten years. According to Josephus, the immediate cause of his removal was his treatment of the Samaritans, many of whom he had cruelly slaughtered during a recent tumult. An embassy from the Samaritan senate laid the matter before Vitellius, the proconsul of Syria, who ordered Pilate to Rome to answer for his conduct before Tiberius. But Tiberius died while Pilate was on his voyage thither. He was, however, condemned by Caligula, and banished to Gaul, where, according to Eusebius, he ended his life by suicide about the year A. D. 41.

During his procuratorship, as was the custom with the Roman governors, Pilate resided principally at Cæsarea on the coast. He was accustomed, however, to attend all the great festivals of the Jews at Jerusalem, in order to suppress whatever disturbances might arise among the crowds of pilgrims which flocked to the sacred city on those occasions. For this purpose a cohort of Roman soldiers was garrisoned at such times within the city's walls. While in Jerusalem, Pilate occupied the palace of Herod, which did not, as Friedlich states, join the castle

of Antonia, but, according to Josephus, was connected with the tower Hippicus in the western part of the city. It was at this time called, as in John xviii. 28, the *Prætorium*.

Along the bridge, which, spanning the valley of the Tyropæon, united Mount Moriah with Mount Zion, Jesus is hurried by his bloodthirsty judges. Scrupulous to observe most carefully the requirements of their traditions, the clamoring multitude halt before the gate of the *Prætorium*, lest by entering within its unhallowed enclosure they should render themselves unclean for the festival, which is now at hand. Through its portals, however, they thrust their prisoner, in order that he may be brought by the guard before Pilate for the confirmation of their sentence. They think, doubtless, that their demand will be granted without delay; but the procurator, at first true to his Roman instincts of justice, leaving the judgment hall, goes forth to the Jews without, and calls for the specific charges on which they had based their sentence. These they wisely suppress, and craftily substitute others of a political nature, accusing Jesus of exciting sedition among the people, in order to overthrow the existing government. But, as has well been said by another, "Pilate knew too much about Jewish expectations to suppose that the Sanhedrim would hate and persecute one who would free them from Roman authority." He returns accordingly to the judgment hall to investigate the charges preferred, and the examination before Pilate begins.

As represented by the Evangelists, this examination was conducted by Pilate himself, for though the prætor at Rome, and the *proprætors* in their provinces had their *quæstors* for this purpose, the procurators always performed this office themselves. The trial was speedily brought to a close. Satisfied of the innocence of the accused, Pilate reappeared before the impatient multitude without, saying, "I find in him no fault at all." In their disappointment and rage, the high priests and the scribes, with still greater vehemence, renewed their charges against Christ, adding, however, the remark, that he whom they had condemned, in his efforts to excite a rebellion among the people, had taught his seditious doctrines, not only in Jerusalem, but "from Galilee to this place."

These last words suggested to the hitherto perplexed procu-

rator a question which he had thus far entirely overlooked, and he asked "whether the man were a Galilean?" Assured that he was, Pilate at once declared that this then was a case in which he had no jurisdiction whatever. Accordingly, availing himself of a principle then generally recognized among the Romans of sending a criminal from the *forum apprehensionis* to his *forum originis* or *domicilii*, he abruptly led Jesus away from his enraged accusers, and delivered him into the power of Herod, the tetrarch of Perea and Galilee, who, though he resided chiefly at Tiberias, was at this time, as a Jew, at the capital, in order to celebrate the great festival of his nation, the Passover.

But Pilate, in this act, evidently thought not only to rid himself of a troublesome mob, and of all responsibility in so difficult a matter, but also, as we learn from Luke, to regain the friendship of Herod, which, probably on account of his treatment of certain of Herod's Galilean subjects, as well as his general disregard for the latter's authority, he had recently forfeited.

#### JESUS BEFORE HEROD.

Herod, to whom Jesus was now sent, was Herod Antipas, a son of Herod the Great. He was originally designated by his father as his successor, but on the death of Herod the Great, the kingdom was left to Archelaus, while Antipas received instead the appointment of "tetrarch of Perea and Galilee." He married first the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia Petræa; but while in Rome, sometime afterwards, he made overtures of marriage to Herodias, the wife of his half-brother Philip, and the sister of Agrippa the Great. His wife, informed of his design, succeeded, notwithstanding the precautions of Herod in effecting her escape to the dominions of her father. Indignant on account of this insult which his daughter had received from her Jewish husband, Aretas entered the territory of Herod with a large army, and in battle defeated his forces with great loss. Not long before this contest, at the request of Salome, the daughter of Herodias, Herod had beheaded John the Baptist in the castle of Machærus beyond the Jordan. Accordingly, Josephus says that "some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that justly, as a punishment for what he did against John, who was called

the Baptist. For Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God; and so to come to baptism." The closing years of Herod's life were spent in exile; for having come to Rome, at the instigation of Herodias, in order to receive from Caligula the title of king, he was accused of certain political designs by emissaries from the court of Agrippa, and banished first to Lyons in Gaul, and afterwards to Spain, where he at length died.

We do not read that the Saviour ever visited Tiberias, though it was so near the scene of much of his public labors; nor had he ever met in his teachings from village to village the crafty worldling who had made that city his capital. But Herod had heard from time to time of his wonderful works, and, as we learn from Luke, had long desired an interview with him, though his reproving conscience assured him, that, in Jesus, he should recognize none other than John the Baptist, whom he had beheaded. When, accordingly, the Saviour, by order of Pilate, was brought a prisoner before him, he was pleased, not only on account of the courtesy which the Roman procurator had thus shown to him, but also because he hoped that this wonder worker, whose fame was in all Galilee, would, at his request, perform some mighty miracle in his presence. But much to Herod's chagrin, the Saviour throughout the interview maintained a profound silence. The chief priests and scribes who had followed their victim thither, observing the tetrarch's disappointment, renewed their angry clamors, and demanded with still greater vehemence a confirmation of their sentence. Herod, however, mindful of his loss of popular favor on account of his imprisonment and murder of John the Baptist, refused to listen to their urgent appeals, and forthwith sent Jesus back to the *Prætorium* of Pilate, arrayed in a white robe, and followed by his derisive taunts.

According to Friedlich, the robe in which Herod and his warriors arrayed the Saviour, was the white mantle worn on festival occasions among the Romans, either by persons distinguished in civil life, or by those of high military rank. The mockery, therefore, lay in this, that Herod, in bitter irony, sought thus to characterize Jesus as some celebrated person, or

as one "who, at the head of his army, was about to go forth for the defence of his realm."

The white robe was also worn among the Romans by those who desired to be regarded as candidates for public office, and were accordingly called *candidati*. Some, on this account, have supposed that Herod, in imitation of a custom well known to Pilate, designed thus to set forth the pretensions of Christ to the dignity of the Messiahship.

Ellicott adopts a different view. *Λαμπρός*, he says, "does not necessarily involve the idea of whiteness." Accordingly he portrays Christ as "clad in a shining kingly robe, as if Herod desired to intimate that for such pretenders to the throne of David, neither the tetrarch of Galilee nor the procurator of Judæa need reserve any heavier punishment than their ridicule and contempt." So also Bengel, who says, "Herodes videtur contemtim voluisse significare, se nil metuere ab hoc rege. Sed revera eum honoravit inscius veste, ut Pilatus titulo crucis."

#### JESUS AGAIN BEFORE PILATE.

And now Jesus stands again in Pilate's judgment hall. Uncondemned by Herod, however, he comes only to renew the procurator's embarrassment; for while the latter is more than ever convinced of the innocence of the accused, he can not, if he would, close his ears to the angry surges of the tumult without. Pilate now begins to waver. Going forth from the Prætorium to the chief priests, and the rulers, and the people, though he reasserts the innocence of Jesus, he proposes to so far yield to the desires of the Sanhedrim, as to inflict upon him some slight punishment, and then release him. But with scorn and indignation they reject the proposal.

It was the custom of the Roman procurators at this high festival of the Jewish nation, to order the release of some criminal whom the people should designate. The origin of this custom is uncertain. No traces of it are found either in the sacred writings of the Jews, or in the Talmud. A similar practice, however, existed among the Romans and the Greeks. It would seem, therefore, to have been introduced by the new rulers of Judæa, and perhaps by Pilate himself, who thought

thus to conciliate the good will of a people who bore the Roman yoke only with growing impatience.

Pilate, unsuccessful in his attempts to soften the malice of the enemies of Christ, and mindful of this custom, now turned from the chief priests to the people, who had gathered in crowds before the Prætorium; and in the exercise of his prerogative proposed to release, at their request, one of two, the notorious Barabbas, who for sedition and murder had recently been cast into prison; or Christ, whom but a few days before, they had welcomed to their capital as the Son of David. Pilate doubtless thought that whatever might be the opinion of the Sanhedrim, the people, many of whom in their Judean or Galilean homes, had witnessed the miracles of Christ, and had listened to his teachings, would be true to their sympathies. Accordingly he ascended his judgment seat in order to receive and declare their decision.

This judgment seat of Pilate, as we learn from John xix. 13, was without the Prætorium, in a place called *Λιθόστρωτον*, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha. Lightfoot supposes that the evangelist here means the hall Gazith, where the Sanhedrim sat, "because it was paved with smooth square stones." But it does not appear that the hall Gazith was called the Pavement. Moreover, as we have already shown from Josephus, this place was no longer occupied by the Sanhedrim in their deliberations. By the term *Λιθόστρωτον* is more properly meant the tessellated pavement, on which, after the time of Sylla, the tribunal of the Romans, wherever removed, was usually erected. Thus Suetonius states that Julius Cæsar, in his campaigns, carried with him for the purpose, the square pieces of marble of which such pavements were constructed. Such was the place of Pilate's tribunal.

Meanwhile the chief priests had not been idle. Perceiving that their prize was fast slipping from their grasp, they had rallied in full force, and hurrying hither and thither among the crowd, had succeeded, by threats or entreaties, in so far infusing their own spirit into the people, that when Pilate now formally renewed his proposition from the judgment seat, "Which of the two will ye that I release unto you?" they answered at once, Barabbas. Pilate, disappointed, as if to invite them to recall this unexpected answer, asks, "What will ye then that I shall do

with him whom ye call the King of the Jews?" They answer with a shout, "Crucify him!" In vain Pilate remonstrated—they cry out only the more vehemently, "Crucify him, crucify him!" And as Luke says, "the voices of them, and of the chief priests, prevailed."

The opposition of the procurator was now removed. But though he had yielded, he was unwilling to be understood as sanctioning the crime which the Jews were about to commit. Accordingly taking water, he washed his hands in their presence, at the same time saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person."

This was a Jewish custom, and a symbol of innocence. Thus in Deut. xxi. 1—10, we learn that if a man were found slain in a field, and it were not known who had committed the murder, the elders and the judges of the nearest city were to slay a heifer, and having then washed their hands, were to say, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it." So, likewise, David, in Psalm xxvi, says, "I will wash mine hands in innocency." Pilate, however, by this symbolic act, not only asserted his perfect innocence in the matter, but at the same time, administered a cutting rebuke to the members of the Sanhedrim who had decreed the Saviour's death. Yet they, satisfied in that they had gained their point, answered with a contemptuous sneer, "His blood be on us, and on our children."

Having accordingly given orders for the release of Barabbas, Pilate led Jesus away to be scourged. Among the Jews, this was the usual punishment for violations of the law, and was inflicted not only by order of the regular judicial tribunals, but also, it would seem, by ecclesiastical authority. Among the Romans it was the custom to scourge those condemned to be crucified; and oftentimes the punishment was so severe, that during its infliction, the victim died. This mode of punishment was also employed by them, both in order to extort from the delinquent a confession, and as a penalty for some criminal offense. Scourging, however, according to the Porcian and Sempronian laws, could not be inflicted on Roman citizens, but only on slaves. That this principle was not always regarded in the provinces of the empire, is illustrated by Cicero in his oration against Verres.



The instruments employed in scourging were either slender rods of wood, or, in severe cases, leathern thongs, into which were fastened pointed bones, or pieces of lead.

The scene is again changed, and we behold, within the *Prætorium*, the Saviour, faint from bitter scourging, enduring the cruel mockeries of Pilate's guard. Over his lacerated body they throw a scarlet cloak, such as was usually worn at that time by the Roman soldiers, and upon his head they bind a crown of thorns. Then having placed a reed in his hand for a sceptre, they bow the knee before him in derision, exclaiming: "Hail, King of the Jews!" Adding insult to insult, they spit upon him, and smite upon his head with the sceptre reed.

The sufferings which Christ had already undergone moved Pilate now to make still another effort to save his life. He could not but believe that if the multitude should see him bleeding and in pain, their hearts would beat in sympathy with his own, and that they would at once recall their cruel sentence. But no! Having again brought the Saviour without the *Prætorium*, he had hardly uttered the words, "Behold the man!" when, with a shout, the priestly mob renewed their demand, "Crucify him, crucify him!" In their impatience, they betrayed to Pilate the true cause of their hatred to Christ by bringing forward the charge on which they had condemned him to death: he had said that he was the "Son of God." The procurator now more clearly saw that this was purely a matter of the Jews, a question of their religion, and he still hesitated. The words, "Son of God," had caught his ear, and perhaps, as Ellicott suggests, caused him to feel that he might "be braving the wrath of some unknown deity." Again he returned to the *Prætorium*, and after the memorable conversation with our Lord which followed, reappeared before the multitude without, fully determined, it would seem, to release their prisoner. But the Jews understood well the character of Pilate, and had in reserve another and yet more powerful argument; so that no sooner had he declared this resolve, than they exclaimed, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar."

Pilate, ambitious and calculating, knew that in these words there was concealed no idle threat. As procurator, he had

never been popular among the Jews, while the Emperor Tiberius, "gloomy and superficial," was one with whom such charges would easily prevail. Trampling, therefore, upon his convictions of duty, he now determined to sacrifice Christ rather than peril his official existence. But as we have already seen, what now he so greatly feared came to pass in the first years of Caligula.

Having taken again his place on the judgment seat, Pilate now formally declared the sentence of death: "Thou shalt go to the cross." Christ was then delivered to the soldiers, who after they had stripped off the scarlet robe, and had clothed him in his own garments, led him forth without the city to be crucified.

JESUS ON HIS WAY TO CALVARY.

Crucifixion as a mode of punishment was known to most of the nations of antiquity. Whether it was practised by the Jews is a disputed question. Among the Romans it was almost wholly confined to the punishment of criminals of the lower classes, slaves the most worthless and degraded. Hence the cross was regarded with the profoundest horror, and closely connected, as Gibbon says, "with the ideas of guilt and of ignominy." Hence, too, the preaching of the cross was considered by the Greeks "foolishness." Says Justin Martyr: "From this circumstance," the crucifixion of Christ, "the heathen are fully convinced of our madness for giving the second place after the immutable and eternal God, and Father of all, to a person who was crucified." So, too, the preaching of the cross became "a stumbling block" to the Jews. Says Trypho: "We need hesitate before we believe that a person who was so ignominiously crucified could have been the Messiah; for it is written in the law 'cursed is every one who is hanged on a cross.'"

The cross was sometimes constructed in the form of the letter X, and sometimes in the form of the letter T; but more generally in the form familiarly known to us as the Roman cross. The latter, according to tradition, was the one on which the Saviour was crucified.

It was the custom to compel those thus condemned to die to bear their cross to the place of execution. In this manner Jesus

went forth until, fainting from loss of blood, and oppressed by the sorrows of the hour, he sank under the heavy burden, and his cross was laid on Simon, a Cyrenian, who was just then entering the city. Nothing more is known of him than may be learned from this statement of the Evangelists. Bengel supposes that he lived in one of the villages near Jerusalem. From Mark's words, "the father of Alexander and Rufus," we may perhaps infer that he was one of the disciples of Christ.

The place where Jesus was led to the crucifixion is called by Matthew, Mark, and John, Golgotha, but by Luke, Calvary; Calvaria being the Latin version of Golgotha, which is an Aramaic form of a Hebrew word meaning a skull. The term is explained by the sacred writers as meaning the place of a skull. Some suppose that the spot was the usual place of crucifixion, and from the burial of those executed there came to abound in skulls; others suppose that the word was employed on account of the skull-like appearance of the place itself. The latter view is especially unsatisfactory, for, as has been observed by Stanley and others, there is no indication, whatever, in the sacred narrative, that would lead us to accept the common expression Mount Calvary.

The situation of Golgotha has been the subject of much dispute. Tradition has fixed upon the spot now occupied by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. But as this is within the limits of Jerusalem as described by Josephus, and as the Saviour was crucified without the gate, Heb. xiii. 12, the traditionary site is generally rejected. Dr. Robinson conjectures "that the place was probably on a great road leading from one of the gates; and such a spot could only be found upon the western or northern sides of the city on the roads leading towards Joppa or Damascus."

When the condemned had borne his cross to the place of execution he was stripped of his clothes, and, in accordance with a Jewish custom, a stupifying potion was given him for the purpose of deadening the nerves, and thereby lessening the pain to be endured. He was then nailed, or secured to the cross. In some instances this was done before the cross was erected, but more commonly, however, as in Esther vii. 10, after it had been placed in its position. When the criminal was bound to the

cross, and thus left to die, his sufferings were greatly prolonged. The nailing, which was through the hands and the feet, though more painful, brought to the sufferer a speedier release.

#### THE CRUCIFIXION.

Surrounded by a Roman guard, and followed by jeering foes and weeping friends, Jesus comes at length to Golgotha. The soldiers, under the direction of the centurion, make ready the cross. Then the clothes are stripped from the Saviour's body, and he is offered the usual cup of "wine mingled with myrrh." But no; about to pour out his soul unto death an offering for sin, he will do it with an unclouded mind, knowing that it hath pleased the Lord to bruise him. All is now prepared, and lifting him up to the cross, and nailing his hands and feet, with two robbers, one on either side, they crucify the world's Redeemer.

The title which was written by Pilate and placed over the Saviour's head, was, say the Evangelists, in letters of Greek, of Latin and of Hebrew. All of these languages had their representatives in the pilgrims which at this season of the year crowded the sacred city.

With regard to the time of the crucifixion there arises a difficulty in harmonizing Mark's statement with John's. Mark xv. 25, says, "and it was the third hour, and they crucified him," while John xix. 14, says that it was about the sixth hour when Pilate pronounced the sentence and delivered Jesus to be crucified. Some suppose that the Saviour was crucified between "the third and sixth hours, and that one Evangelist specified the hither the other the farther terminus." The objection, of course, to such a view is, that while John mentions the further terminus, or the sixth hour, he connects it with events which preceded the crucifixion. Others suppose that on account of an error by the copyists we have in John *ἕκτῃ* for *τρίτῃ*. Another view, and one more plausible than either of these, is that John designed his Gospel primarily for the churches of Asia Minor, and accordingly adopted the Roman method of computing time, that is, from midnight, and not from sunrise as among the Hebrews.

From the third until the sixth hour, that is until midday,

Jesus endured the taunts of the passers-by, and the mockeries of the priests, as well as the lingering pains of crucifixion. It was while enduring the agonies of such a death that Jesus spoke pardon to the penitent robber at his side, saying, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

The term Paradise is found in most of the languages of the East, and seems to have originally signified a garden or park. The Greek translators of the Pentateuch, and Jerome in the Latin Vulgate, employed this word to designate the garden in Eden. Among the Jews, however, it came to be used to denote the abode of the blest in the life to come. When, accordingly, the Saviour tells the dying robber, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," he uses a common expression, which could be understood only as synonymous with heaven.

It was now midday; but as if to hide from the face of heaven the terrible scene which Golgotha presented, a veil spread itself along the skies, "and there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour."

Some have found a confirmation of this phenomenon in the mention of an eclipse of intense darkness by Phlegon, a freedman of the Emperor Hadrian. But even if it could be shown that the crucifixion, and Phlegon's eclipse, happened the same year, which is denied by Weisler and DeWette, still the two could not be regarded as identical, since no eclipse could have occurred at the time of the Passover when the moon was full. Some who have written in opposition to Gibbon's remarks in his fifteenth chapter on the phenomenon, as well as Milman, Neander, and others, refer this darkness to that preternatural gloom which usually precedes an earthquake. But Alford well remarks, "that it is clear that no earthquake in the ordinary sense of the word is here intended." He agrees with Ellicott that this darkness was "strictly supernatural, the appointed testimony of sympathizing nature." Blunt, in his *Scripture Coincidences*, thinks that there is a confirmation of this view in the "change of conduct," which after the sixth hour was observed "in the merciless crew that surrounded the cross."

About the ninth hour, while this darkness still brooded over the scene of the crucifixion, the Saviour, in the anguish of his soul breaking the deep silence of nature, uttered in the opening

words of the twenty-second Psalm, that touching appeal, 'Ηλι, 'Ηλι, λαμὰ σαβαχθαυι; "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Lightfoot says that 'Ηλι, 'Ηλι is not properly Syriac, and that when those who stood near the cross said, "Behold he calleth Elias," they truly so understood the Saviour's words. Yet as the whole phrase in which these words stand is a literal quotation from the twenty-second Psalm with the exception of σαβαχθαυι, an Aramaic form, the Jews, familiar as they were with the writings of David, could not have understood him as calling for Elias. We may rather suppose that the returning light was accompanied with the mockeries which preceded the departing shadows. Ha! exclaim the emboldened spectators in bitter irony, and with a play on the Saviour's words—ha! he calls for Elias. "Let us see whether Elias will come to save him." Mark ascribes these words to one who at the call, "I thirst," John xix. 28, filled a sponge with the sour wine which was the common drink of the Roman soldiers, and placing it on a reed held it at the Saviour's mouth. It may be that this was done by a secret follower of Christ, who, wishing to soothe the agonies of his dying master, joined in the derisive taunt, "Let us see whether Elias will come to save him," in order to minister to the sufferer's wants unsuspected.

With the words, "It is finished—Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," the sufferings of our Saviour ended. His enemies had accomplished their purpose, and there was no more that they could do. But with them it was not an hour for rejoicing. Though the darkness had rolled away, and they could see their victim motionless on the cross, yet a new and more dreadful terror seized them. For with these last words of Christ, the vail of the temple which separated the holy place from the holy of holies, was rent asunder, the earth rocked beneath their feet, and even the doors of the tombs around the sacred city were opened. Well did the awe struck centurion say, "Truly this was the Son of God."

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE DEMONIACS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE writers of the New Testament speak of demons and possessions by evil spirits. There are many who maintain that Jesus and his apostles adopted this phraseology *ad hominem*, accommodating their words to the prejudices and superstitions of the times and of the people with whom they were conversant; while in fact they spoke of diseases, epileptics, hypochondriacs and deranged people. But others dissent from such views, and maintain that they meant to be understood as speaking of real demons and of possessions by evil spirits. We propose to examine, in this paper, these different opinions. We first advert to the arguments of those who deny the existence of demons in the proper sense, and of the real possessions by evil spirits.

Those who maintain that demoniacs are only epileptics, hypochondriacs, or deranged people, go back to the notions of the Greeks and Romans of a very early period, for the purpose of showing that demons were but the ghosts of dead men, who once sustained infamous characters, and whose malignant dispositions continued after their departure from the body, and influenced them to haunt and afflict men who were still in the body.

Then they assume that the like notions prevailed among the Jews, and that Christ and his apostles, if they intended to be understood, were obliged to use language in accommodation to these superstitions.

But what proof is there that the Jews understood by demons the spirits of dead men? We see none whatever. The fact that Greeks and Romans adopted such superstition avails nothing in proof that the Jews of our Saviour's time believed in such absurd opinions. On the contrary, it is well known that the Jews believed in the existence of holy and wicked angels, and that they derived these sentiments from their sacred Scriptures; that they understood by demons, angel sthat had fallen from their original high standing, and who were the agents of Satan, the prince of the demons.

That such was their opinion, will be seen by recurring to



Matthew, 12th chapter, and to parallel passages in the other Evangelists. The Pharisees allege that Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of the demons. Thus it seems plain that they accounted wicked angels as agents of a powerful prince who employed and controlled them.

Is it not, then, a mere assumption that the Jews believed the ghosts of dead men to be the tormentors of the living?

But we stop not here. We are constrained to consider the three great points which they attempt to establish.

First. It is maintained that the symptoms of demoniacs were like the ordinary symptoms of epilepsy, or hypochondria, or derangement. Supposing we admit that some of the symptoms were the same, will that prove the truth of the assumption? Some of the symptoms of an epileptic may be like some of those of a hypochondriac, and some of those of a hypochondriac may be like those of a mad person. But all this is far from proving that epilepsy, hypochondria and insanity are all the same. In order to make this argument of any validity it must be shown that demoniacs never exhibited anything contrary to, or different from the above named diseases. But this has not been shown, nor can it be. We expect to show in a subsequent part of this discussion that demoniacs exhibited many things that were altogether irreconcilable with the notion that they were only the subjects of those above mentioned diseases. And we proceed to another point.

Secondly. It is maintained that demoniacs are only diseased persons. To prove this assumption many cases are cited. The first is that of the man possessed of "an unclean spirit," who dwelt in the tombs, who was boisterous and ungovernable, and who attacked travellers as they passed that way. Mark v. 2, and Luke viii. 27. This person, it is said, "showed all the signs of insanity." "He had the wild notion that innumerable evil demons dwelt within him." "And the great strength which he showed in breaking the chains with which they attempted to bind him is just what we often witness in the insane, who exhibit a surprising degree of strength." His address to Jesus as the Son of God is accounted for on the supposition that he had "some lucid intervals," and "and had heard enough of Jesus to account him the promised Messiah." His petitions that Jesus

would not "torment him before the time"; and that "he would permit the demons to enter the herd of swine," are alleged as proof positive of derangement.

Besides, it is said, "a real demon would not be likely to choose such a habitation," and that he is called an "unclean spirit," because he was "the spirit of one dead," which was reckoned unclean; and that the "demons did not enter the swine," but that "the crazy man ran after them so impetuously that he frightened them into the water."

Surely this is a very great discovery. But how does it appear that one so exceedingly crazy as to be ungovernable, and a terror to all passers by, dwelling in tombs and cutting himself with stones, and whom no one could bind with chains, had such "lucid intervals" as to know more of the real character of Jesus than all the ruling ecclesiastics of the time, and all the men who had their reason. But a still greater wonder is, that he should have the disposition to do it, after Jesus had commanded his insanity to depart from him and was obeyed.

Why should we not rather suppose that the disease of the man fell suddenly upon the animals; and that through epileptic fits they fell down the precipice into the sea!

Besides, why might not a real demon be as ready to enter swine, as was Satan to choose a serpent to tempt our progenitors, and to destroy the race? What better residence could an "unclean spirit" desire, than "unclean beasts"?

But regard carefully the narrative of the inspired writer, and see how entirely inconsistent with the idea that this man was only a deranged person. "No man could bind him with chains." He had supernatural strength. "He was always night and day in the mountains, or in the tombs." Does it appear that there was any room for "lucid intervals." But the moment that he saw Jesus afar off, "he ran to worship him." This was conduct different from that of all his countrymen, who had always been sane. And it is to be accounted for only by supposing that there was something within him which recognized the real character of the Son of God. Therefore he said: "Jesus, thou Son of God, Most High, I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not." It would seem that this man was more fully acquainted with the character of Jesus than

all the sane men of the Sanhedrim. Is this consistent with the idea that he was merely a deranged man? Besides, would insanity say, "If thou cast me out, suffer me to go into the herd of swine"? Or if it was the doing of a crazy man to destroy these swine, how could the whole city lay the blame upon Jesus, and demand that he should leave the place. Indeed, is there not much in this Gadarene demoniac that shows the absurdity of assuming that he was merely a deranged man?

The second case, which is brought in proof that the symptoms of demoniacs are like those of insanity, epilepsy or hypochondria, is that of the dumb and blind man mentioned in Matthew xii. 22, and Luke xi. 14; which some suppose to be the same as that related in Mark vii. 32. It is supposed that insanity or melancholy was the disease. But does either of these deprive a man of sight or of speech? Who ever heard of such a case? It is not said that this man was born blind, or a deaf mute. But it is implied that an evil demon obstructed his sight, and prevented his speech! We can see no evidence that this man was an epileptic, hypochondriac, or insane.

The next case brought is that of the young man mentioned in Matthew xvii. 15, and in Luke ix. 38, who was lunatic from his childhood; who was seized and torn by an evil demon, and who fell often into the fire and into the water; who foamed at the mouth and gnashed his teeth, and wallowed upon the ground. It is assumed that this was a case of epilepsy merely. But this is a mere begging of the question. What if these symptoms resembled somewhat those of that disease? Might not the cause be different? If one person is deprived of reason by intemperance, and another by a blow upon the skull, and if they exhibit a similarity of appearance and conduct, is it proper to affirm that the latter person is a drunkard? And why should the opposers of real possession by evil spirits assume, contrary to the inspired word, that this is a case of epilepsy? But

The third point which some opposers of real possessions attempt to establish is, that the Evangelists, Christ, and the Apostles, regarded demoniacs as merely diseased persons. It is assumed, but not proved, "that the Evangelists introduce demoniacs among sick people, as a separate class of sick," and "that in some instances they comprehend demoniacs under the head

of diseased persons without expressly mentioning them"; and that they did not think it necessary always to mention them, because they did not conceive that there was anything in their case sufficiently peculiar to render the distinction of any importance.

But how did these critics learn that demoniacs are included where there is no mention of them? We look at the Scripture narratives, and see that continually the writers do distinguish between demoniacs and diseased persons. "And they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments; and those that were possessed with demons; and those that were lunatic; and those that had the dropsy." Matthew iv. 24: In commissioning the apostles he said: "Heal the sick; cleanse the lepers; raise the dead; cast out devils," [demons.] Matthew x. 8. "They brought unto him all that were diseased, and those that were possessed with demons." Mark i. 32. "And he gave them power and authority over all demons, and to cure diseases." Luke ix. 1.

It would seem that there is no ground for the assumption that demoniacs and diseased persons are the same, for the distinctness of the above quotations must settle the question.

But again, it is said that the word demon is used tropically for disease, as Bacchus is for wine, and Ceres for corn; that Christ and the Evangelists made use of language very much as physicians in speaking of "St. Anthony's fire," "the nightmare," and "lunacy," although the causes of these diseases are well known, and there is no ground for using such language except by accommodation. But we object to such an abuse of the divine word. It makes Christ but a vain empiric and the Evangelists but mysterious quacks. It represents them as imposing upon the credulity of men, and making use of the superstitions of the ignorant to advance their own honor. Could it consist with the uniform simplicity and integrity of Christ to speak of demons as he did, to command them, to threaten them, and to speak of them as knowing him, if it were but a hallucination of superstition? When the demoniacs cried, "We know thee who thou art, the Son of God," would it consist with integrity to forbid them to make him known, because they knew that he was the Christ, if it were all a delusion? And if any will attempt to free themselves from difficulty by represent-

ing it as mere tropes and figures, they assume principles of exegesis that will run all truth into myths, and destroy all history and all certainty.

What can we do with the words put into the mouths of demons, if we deny real possessions by evil spirits? "Thou Jesus of Nazareth, art thou come to torment us before the time?" "We know thee, who thou art, the Holy One of God"; "I adjure thee by God that thou torment me not?" How absurd to attribute all this to insanity, hypochondria, or epilepsy, and how would our blessed Saviour appear, if the opponents of real possessions could maintain their positions! He would be acting the ridiculous farce of commanding the ravings of insanity, the reveries of hypochondria and the stupidity of epilepsy not to make him known; because they knew that he was the Messiah!

But it is alleged, fourthly, that "the doctrine of real possessions is inconsistent with the other doctrines of Christ and his apostles," and therefore they could not have intended to teach it. And in proof of this it is urged that Christ and his apostles teach us that all things are under the direction of God, however minute they may be; and that it can not be supposed that God would permit so great miseries to be inflicted by demons.

How remarkably logical and forcible is this argument! As though all things could not be under the control of God, as truly when he permits demons to assail us as when he suffers insanity or epilepsy to afflict us! But do they not admit that it consists with the perfections of God to allow these evils to come in some way? And how does it appear that it would be more inconsistent with the divine character to allow demons to inflict these sufferings than to occasion them by diseases? The evils are the same on either supposition. Besides, it is a fact well known that God permits evil men to inflict great sufferings upon their fellow creatures, and those of a most appalling kind. Why then may he not suffer evil spirits to do the same? Should it be said, by way of objection to this, that they are of a different order of beings, and that it can not be supposed that God would allow them to inflict such evils on men, because the goodness of God forbids it? But why, then, does not the

goodness of God forbid wild beasts of great power and rage to assail men? They are of a "different order of beings." Their argument would seem to be futile.

But, again, it is said, "that wicked spirits are kept in custody, and reserved unto the judgment of the great day; and that this can not be reconciled with the notion that they are roving about to do mischief."

But can not an evil spirit be in custody while it is accomplishing some purpose of God in afflicting men? Are not the tenants of a state prison in custody, while they have such liberty as to employ themselves in the business which the government prescribes for them? Or will it be said that Satan was not in custody while he scaled the walls of Paradise to sow sedition? Because some length of chain was given him, was he liberated from the place where he is reserved unto judgment? And if indeed this prince of the demons has influence upon the children of men, though reserved in chains, what absurdity is there in supposing that his subjects have likewise an influence upon men? And what is there in this opinion that contradicts the doctrine that the fallen angels are reserved in chains under darkness, though they may do mischief to the children of men?

But, again, it is said, "that Christ no where denies that the evils in question were the result of diseases." But what occasion had he to deny it? There were none in his time that had made such discoveries as have since been made; that these evils were the results of insanity, melancholy, or epilepsy. And how could Christ be expected to say what was not called for in the circumstances? But he has said enough concerning real possessions by evil spirits to convince reasonable men that he held a different opinion from those who deny them.

But we now turn away from "these whispers of fancy" and the delusions of vain critics, to the direct arguments which prove the existence of demoniacal possessions. It will be impossible to do justice to the subject, however, without some apparent repetition of things already said or implied in the above discussion.

1. The demons are represented as saying enough to prove their real existence: "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God Most High! Art thou come to torment us before the time?" And they uttered many things that insane

men or epileptics would not have known. Besides, they answered questions with propriety that were proposed to them. Demons were declared to depart from the possessed and enter into the swine. And is it possible for a sane man to suppose that either epilepsy or insanity is here represented as invading two thousand swine! Or if the swine had been frightened down the precipice by the boisterous mad-men in the presence of the multitude, why did the whole city complain of our Saviour? Why should we not, then, believe the direct testimony of the sacred historian that here were demons, and that they did the mischief?

2. No symptoms of disease are implied in the narrative concerning the dumb demoniac in Matthew ix. 32, and in Luke xi. 24, nor in the dumb and blind demoniac in Matthew xii. 22. For anything that appears to the contrary, these persons were in a sound state of bodily health, and nothing but demoniacal influence interrupted the use of the organs of speech and of sight. Moreover, did anybody ever know that insanity, melancholy, or epilepsy, made men blind or dumb? "*Credat Judæus Apella!*"

3. But we are informed that the damsel of Philippi, Acts xvi. 16, practised divination, and brought much gain to her employers. Could this have been a deranged person, or an epileptic? Or would such an one know enough of Paul and Timothy, or others, to say: "These men are the servants of the Most High God, who show unto us the way of salvation"?

4. The account of certain vagabond Jews, in Acts xix. 13, who attempted to cast out demons by calling over the demoniacs the name of Jesus, proves beyond question that there was something in the case besides disease. The evil spirit said: "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" and the demoniac "leaped upon them, and overcame them; and they fled from the house naked and wounded." Here were the seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, together with the chief priests; and surely these were enough to confine one crazy man, if that were all that was needed. And how can we account for the results upon these pretenders without admitting the existence of a powerful demon?

5. The demoniacs themselves affirmed that they had legions



of demons, and likewise the Apostles and Evangelists affirmed that those "possessed with demons" were brought to Christ, and that demons departed from them at his command. This is said and implied in various ways and at different times without any hesitation. But had they used such language by way of accommodation to the notions of the age, why should they not have said, "Such persons as were supposed to be possessed with demons were brought to Christ"? Besides, did not Christ himself say: "I cast out demons and I do cures today and to-morrow," without any intimation that he meant merely the healing of diseases? Could this have been said consistently with his integrity if there had been no possessions by demons? And

6. It was shown, in considering the arguments on the other side, that the sacred writers made a palpable distinction between demoniacs and diseased persons, and between casting out demons and healing diseased persons. And I need not here quote the many instances in which this is done. It is sufficient to advert to one or two instances, thus: "They brought unto Jesus all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with demons." And Jesus himself made the like distinction, as is seen in a passage already quoted: "Behold I cast out demons, and do cures today and to-morrow." And he said to the disciples in his apostolic commission: "Heal the sick; cleanse the lepers; cast out demons."

Would Christ and his apostles have been so particular in making this distinction had there been no demons and no demoniacs? It seems to be altogether improbable, to say nothing of the dishonesty of so doing.

7. Demoniacs, as has been already implied, were the only persons among the Jews who treated Christ with respect, or who seemed to understand his real character. In some way they knew that Jesus was the Son of God, the son of David, the true Messiah, and they treated him with all reverence and homage. It looks, therefore, as if these demoniacs were about the only sane persons in Judæa and Galilee! They certainly knew what epilepsy and insanity never taught them. They show many things which were wholly incompatible with the notion that they were merely diseased persons.

8. Christ spake to demons, asked their names, and gave

them commands. They also answered him, and obeyed his commands. "He forbade them to speak, because they knew that he was the Christ." How could this have been on any other principle than that the doctrine of real possessions by evil spirits is true? Any other supposition implies that Christ was a deceiver. Besides

9. When the seventy disciples returned from fulfilling their commission, one ground of their joy was, that even the demons were subject to them. Now here was a fair opportunity for Christ to explain himself, and to give clear views in opposition to demoniacal influence. If he had before spoken *ad hominem*, why did he not say: "I have heretofore used language in accommodation to the superstitions of the times, but I would not by any means have you deceived, or have you believe that there is any just grounds for your present rejoicing"? Would not this have been natural, and honest, and appropriate, had there been no demons and no demoniacs? But what did he do? He used language that was adapted still to mislead them, if there were no truth in the doctrine of demoniacal possessions: "I beheld Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven! Behold I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions and over all the power of The Enemy! Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, that τὰ πνεύματα, the spirits, are subject unto you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven." Here Christ plainly speaks of spirits, and evidently means to convey the idea that demons had been made subject to the disciples, and he meant so unless he was a deceiver.

10. Can we account for the language which Christ used when the Pharisees accused him of casting out demons by Beelzebub, without maintaining that he believed in real possessions? He showed that a kingdom divided against itself could not stand, and that if one devil expelled another, the kingdom of darkness would come to nought. And he inquired: "How can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, unless he first bind the strong man?" As much as to say: "How could I expel the agents of Beelzebub unless I first bound Beelzebub himself?" It is futile to say: "This is *ad hominem*," that is, according to the professed belief of the Jews. We can not construe it according to any legitimate principles of exegesis, with-

out admitting the existence and agency of demons, and without perceiving that he claimed the power to bind Satan and his legions. And

11. Who ever supposed that any disease would hurt a man by departing from him? But this must be supposed if we admit the notions of the opponents of real possessions. For in Luke iv. 35, when Jesus rebuked the devil which cried with a loud voice, "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God," he said, "Hold thy peace, and come out of him." "And when the demon had thrown him in the midst he came out of him and hurt him not." The people present were amazed, not that disease did not hurt the man by departing from him, but that with authority and power he commanded τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι, the unclean spirits, and they came out.

While we grant, indeed, that for Jesus to heal insanity or epilepsy or any other disease, would have been a display of divine power which ought to convince all that he was sent of God, and that his religion is divine, yet how much more convincing do his miracles appear on the supposition that he commanded all the powers of darkness, and they obeyed him; that he cast down Satan and his agents, and triumphed over the principalities of hell itself?

And why may we not suppose that God permitted the multiplied manifestations of demoniacs at the time of our Saviour's ministry, the more gloriously to display his power, and to furnish irrefragable evidence that he was the Son of God? There was ground for the people's amazement that he could command unclean spirits, and be obeyed by them.

We most sincerely deprecate that false philosophy and that plastic power of exegesis which are attempting to destroy the plain teachings of God's word and the simplicity of the Gospel history, and we would urge all the friends of Christ to stand in the defence of the faith once delivered to the saints; to maintain legitimate exegesis of the Scriptures in opposition to all the crude theories and false assumptions of infidels, neologists, and free thinkers; to frown upon all such as follow in the footsteps of Renan, Colenso, or the writers of the *Westminster Review*, and to ignore that criticism that would turn the most plain and didactic teachings of inspiration into tropes, and figures, and

myths, and anything but what the sacred writers intended, making God's revelation as unintelligible and frivolous as the Sibyllian oracles, and as uncertain as the responses from the Delphic Apollo.

---

### ARTICLE VIII.

#### THE TRUE THEORY OF THE SOUL, AND OF REGENERATION, AND OF CONVERSION:

##### THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS.

OLDER and more thoroughly experimental Christians are surprised at certain things in religious circles, and they find it difficult to gain a satisfactory explanation. They are surprised to find so little deep, painful and pungent conviction of sin preceding supposed regeneration. They are surprised that the change of heart in many is so slightly perceptible at and about the time when it is supposed to take place. They are surprised, too, that no more uniform and thorough, strong piety is shown by many modern converts. To become a Christian seems to them to have been simplified and reduced to an easier, lighter process, than it was seen to be in their earlier days.

Studying the revivals from Edwards' day down through ten or fifteen years of the present century, and comparing them with those of the last twenty years, we find good ground for these contrasting reflections. There must be a cause for such a confessed difference, and it is quite reasonable to seek for an explanation. If becoming a Christian has, with not a few, dropped down into an easy, human act, and the new life become so uneven in its tenor, and the change from the unregenerate to the regenerate state, so unmarked by violent and overwhelming convictions of guilt, an explanation can be found.

There is a modern theory of becoming a Christian, and within the evangelical school it is novel to the last half century. The theory is partly psychological, and partly theological. With some holding it, the psychology necessitates their theology, but

with most, as we apprehend, their theology necessitates their psychology. In this theory, as we think, lies the solution, in part, of the anomalies in Christian life to which we have referred. We propose, in this paper, to state this theory, and, without controverting it, to show some of its practical bearings on personal religion.

This theory teaches that the soul is not a substance, organism or structure existing before, and separate from, its mental and moral acts. It is not a perfect and personal entity anterior to its activity, as a machine is something preceding and separate from its running. It is, on the contrary, said to be a mere series of exercises, and so entirely so, that we can not conceive of a soul, or its existence, separate from its exercises. We can not conceive of it as distinct from its perceptions and sensibilities and emotions. It is nothing having a mental and moral structure and nature prior to action. As an organism dormant, or inactive, or not yet started in its career, it is taught to be not conceivable. We can have no idea of the soul as the foundation of perception, conscience, memory, reason, volitions, etc., and out of which the exercises of these come. The soul is no agent at all, but only a series of acts, or rather a prolonged and varied activity. The soul is the exercises, and the exercises are the soul, either being the other, and the two identical. The mental or moral act is the actor, and the actor the act. It is as if we should say that the machine and the running are one and the same thing. According to this teaching, personality is only a continuity of thoughts, emotions, judgments, choices and the like. Back of these there is no substance, or organ, or agent, that performs them.

The older and the common notion of the soul is, that it is a being by itself, and the basis, the source, of mental and moral acts; that it, as an agent or person, chooses, purposes, loves, hates, etc., and precedes in time all these exercises, just as a person precedes, and is separate from, his own conduct. But according to the theory in question, personality, or soul, is made as it goes. Exercises constituting the soul, and each person performing his own mental and moral acts, God could not have created the soul of Adam. Our first father made his own soul by his first mental and moral acts. When God pronounced him

"good," he was not finished, and Adam was left to finish himself.

This peculiar and novel theory of the structure and nature of the human soul, as being but a series of exercises, of course must have a theology of peculiar adaptations. Which precedes and necessitates the other we need not inquire; it is probably different with different persons. But if the soul is thus only a serial progression of acts, like the coming of links in an endless chain, how can redemptive grace lay hold of it, except as it catches at the links? These are constantly coming, going, and gone, and can of course be affected only singly, and without any retractive power on the forthcoming act. Grace thus acting would be like Elisha with his new cruise at the outlet of the aqueduct in Jericho, and not at "the spring of the waters." Let us proceed to look at the adjustment of the new psychology and its new theology to each other in particulars.

Native depravity, as a moral corruption and taking effect before moral action, must be discarded, because there is nothing prior to action in which it can inhere. As there is no moral creature or nature preceding moral action in the infant, there is nothing to be corrupted and depraved. So there can be no depravity, except that of conduct or exercises. The soul as a homestead being denied an existence, where moral acts are born and whence they go forth, there is no being, substance or nature that depravity can possess.

Yet it is due to add, that the advocates of this theory confess to a kind of depravity of man, and use much of the language commonly applied to it. For they speak of a bias, tendency, or proclivity to sin. This tendency is said to be active but not culpable; it is preparing certain, inevitable acts of sin, and yet is not morally offensive to God. It infects fatally and totally, they say, each moral act in the infant as they run out in the series, beginning with the very first, yet is there no sin till the act it is biasing and shaping, is completed.

But where this proclivity to sin is located, and how it gains a relation to the forthcoming moral acts, is not made clear. It is said to be in the infant nature; but to what does this nature pertain? According to the theory, exercises constitute the soul; but as the soul can not have a nature till it is constituted,

the nature in which this proclivity inheres can not exist till after the exercises, and therefore can not give them either a good or evil bias. Surely the nature of a thing can not precede, as a separate entity, the existence of the thing of which it is said to be the nature. The nature of the apple can not so precede the existence of the apple as that we can affirm sourness of that nature before the apple is in existence to be sour.

If the exercises constitute the soul, and an innate proclivity to sin give a moral character to the exercises, we are unable to see to what this proclivity belongs. It is evidently a quality, and so belongs to a substance. But what substance? What one is there anterior to the soul that can give it a home?

Dr. Emmons, who is generally supposed to have held and taught this theory of a serial soul, and who has popularized somewhat the theory by his published works, felt the difficulty that we here find. If such proclivity or tendency exist, it must claim for itself a moral character, which it would be hard to disprove. Conceding it would be granting that there can be and is sin, prior to voluntary action, which would destroy Emmonsism. Moreover, if such constitutional tendencies be admitted as preceding and qualifying morally voluntary acts, the acute mind of this master saw that they must pertain to and inhere in something like a soul, which concession would, in another way, destroy Emmonsism, by allowing that the soul is anterior to and more than a series of exercises. To avoid these destructive dilemmas, he referred the certainty of all voluntary action to immediate divine efficiency. The agency direct of God takes the place in his scheme of constitutional tendencies, taste, or disposition, so that God imparts efficiently to the moral exercises, what, in our own theology, we derive from an apostate organism, called soul or heart. Thus :

“He wrought as effectually in the minds of Joseph’s brethren when they sold him, as when they repented and besought his mercy. He not only prepared these persons to act, but made them act. He not only exhibited motives before their minds, but disposed their minds to comply with the motives exhibited. But there was no possible way in which he could dispose them to act right or wrong, but only by producing right or wrong volition in their hearts. And if he produced their bad as well as their good volitions, then his



agency was concerned precisely in the same manner in their wrong, as in their right actions." *WORKS*, Vol. II., p. 441.

But without pausing farther to locate an innocent tendency to sin, existent anterior to the existence of the soul it is to affect, we proceed to unfold this new psychological theory in its relations to theology. The acts of this serial soul, like links in a chain, come into being and run out of it, going from the future, through the present into the past, and this proclivity or tendency to evil, located somewhere near by, depraves these acts *in transitu*. It is said to touch them morally and with a total depravity as they come up and go by. Here guilt first attaches itself to the person. Here and thus man begins to be a sinner, and all his sin consists in sinning. For, the acts thus corrupted are the several choices and volitions of the man, over which he is said to have supreme control, and so is obligated to keep them pure.

Were we controverting this theory, as propounded by Dr. Emmons, we should raise the question here, how a man can be a sinner at all. If God produces the bad volitions, and makes men act them out, as in the case of Joseph's brethren, just cited, we fail to see where either liberty or responsibility attaches to the actor. The objection is pressed against the Calvinistic theory, that an inherited moral tendency to sin makes a man responsible for receiving an irresistible legacy. But what, on the other hand, shall be said of responsibility for sinful acts, so called, that God makes a man perform?

Singularly enough, without any antecedent soul, corrupted and culpable, vitiating these choices as they arise, as from a defiled fountain, all fail to keep their volitions pure. No person escapes wholly and is perfect, nor does any single volition escape wholly or partially. Each volition in all persons is totally corrupted. This tendency, that we are unable to attach to any organism, watching, like some rebel cruiser outside the harbor for every loyal craft, makes a prey of each infantile or older moral act *outgoing*. The apostasy of Adam is said to have some causative connection with all this, but as there is no moral nature inherited to be approbated or disapprobated, and nothing sinful or holy till the person acts and so becomes such, and as he is no soul till the series of exercises begins, this *nexus*

with Adam, in this new scheme, is rather a *nodus*, and harder than the Gordian to be comprehended.

Regeneration, as taught by this scheme, can be best unfolded and illustrated at this point. For these new theorists make it take place just where sin comes in, that is, in these single volitions. We have seen that they concede to us no organism, commonly called soul or heart, out of which "proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit," etc. Were there such a soul in man, antecedent to his exercises, as a fountain of evil, regeneration, we can readily see, might act on it. So could grace make the tree good, and thereby the fruit good. But as this theory allows for no soul as preceding and separate from its exercises, regeneration must take place on the single and separate moral acts of the man. All the heart there is to be regenerated consists in evil exercises, and not in anything preceding, or separate from, or productive of, sinful affections and emotions. It is, therefore, the voluntary acts that must be regenerated, the ruling choices of the man.

But choosing and refusing, loving and hating, and the like moral acts, are wholly human, and acquire their good or bad character from the person performing them. They are right or wrong from the purpose and feeling with which he performs them. He, therefore, is obligated to make them right exercises. This would be regenerating them, the giving of a holy character by the person to his moral acts. And as these acts, by the theory, constitute his heart or soul, this would be making himself a new heart and a new creature. In some great moral crisis, when seriously and profoundly moved, the man, with an intense energy of will and sublime self-determination, resolves himself over to the right, and so becomes a child of God.

As to the agent or agents in this act, constituting the "new creature," men may aid the subject of it in various ways, and God may use a great persuasive force. He may press truths, and combine providences, and enlist conscience, and strive by the Holy Spirit; and all to such a degree that his agency may be called special. Still any and all the aid that God may render is of the nature of argument and motive only, and never rises and changes to the supernatural. He can not counteract

any law of nature, or do any supernatural work. According to this psychology and theology, he works in regeneration only in common ways, and in accordance with common laws, as when he aids the farmer to a specially good harvest. All the efforts of God are resistible, and with the man the change of heart is purposed and optional. The change is one of his own making, and he constitutes himself a Christian by giving to some prominent act a holy character. By a prodigious endeavor he makes a choice and purpose for God and holiness; and but for the bluntness and strangeness of the expression to Orthodox ears, it might afterward be said that he regenerated himself.

It will be seen that this kind of regeneration takes effect only on single exercises, or voluntary acts of the man. As there is no soul, finished and whole, on which regeneration can act, but only this series of exercises, only one exercise can be set right at a time. Each subsequent one must be affected in the same way, as it comes forth. So in this scheme regeneration, like the soul, is a serial process and a continued development; nor, on this theory, do we see how its regeneration can be complete till all the moral exercises of the subject in probation are finished, that is, at death.

Moreover, suppose the subject neglects to resolve any leading purpose or volition into the holy state, does he not under and during that act cease to be regenerate? Unless he is perfectly holy, he is constantly alternating between holy and unholy exercises. Is he not, therefore, constantly oscillating between the regenerate and the unregenerate state? Were there an anterior soul to which the supernatural and re-creating grace of God could introduce a holy taste or disposition, to be fixed and permanent, we could see these vibrations in the volitions from sin to holiness and back again, without feeling that God was constantly gaining and losing the same child of grace.

But if regeneration is only a change of purpose, or a most determined act of will, brought about indeed by great human and divine pressure, and if afterward the purpose wavers, or the will is weak, and the person does frequently what he allows not, how can it be but that regeneration is intermittent? Certainly the Arminian can here find good reasoning, the premises

being conceded, for his doctrine of falling from grace. And why not for his theory of perfection also, since if regeneration takes effect on any one exercise in the serial soul, it for the instant, or while that exercise lasts, has the man wholly in the power of grace?

Such a hypothesis of the structure of the soul, and such views of the nature of sin, and such theory and doctrine and teaching in the matter of regeneration, are novelties of a score or two of years in the evangelical churches; and to them we attribute much of that modification of conviction, submission to God, regeneration and uniform Christian life, to which we referred in the opening of this article.

The conviction of sin preceding the supposed regeneration must be much less pungent, comprehensive and overwhelming, because only single acts and moral exercises are under contemplation. The great fountain of evil is not recognized; the agent who commits all this wickedness is denied an existence: that confederate, organic and all-directing embodiment of sin, an anterior, personal and totally depraved soul, is excluded from the system. And in the scheme of Dr. Emmons, whose system sustains an intimate causal if not parental relation to the views we have been unfolding, even constitutional tendencies to sin are denied, in the judgment of such analytic and sympathizing men as Fitch and N. W. Taylor. No base of supplies for all evil, no storehouse full of the munitions of war, no manufactory and arsenal of all hostile weapons, can be proved and pressed on the sinner. The weapon and the action in a single skirmish or battle, are the front of the offending. No shot and thrust in the Wilderness, or at Chattanooga, can be made to stand out in the enormity of rebellion, like the Tradegar furnaces and iron works, that were in blast and clatter day and night, to supply the material of war. No allowance is made in this theology for a depraved heart back of all sinful conduct, suggesting and stimulating to it, in the first transgression and in all subsequent ones. This system can not logically and legitimately lead a man to cry out from the very depths of a guilty race: "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint." No such case of total moral ruin can be made out, no such utter moral chaos, as makes one feel the

imperative, indispensable need of a divine, supernatural and recreative interposition. Each cup-full is declared to be vitiated, and needing renovation; but the sinner can not be made to look toward Sodom and Gomorrah and behold the smoke of that country going up as the smoke of a furnace, where the lake of bitter waters is made and abideth. Conviction in view of single sins, or of a long series of them, must be slight and superficial, compared with that oppressive, crushing sense of a guilty soul shapen in iniquity, and by nature a child of wrath, and constantly a very body of death.

Under such views and teaching, a change of heart, and entrance on a Christian life, must often appear easier and lighter and less marked. For it is a change wrought in a single act or exercise. It is no comprehensive and total change, setting right a corrupt soul, counteracting a constitutional tendency to sin, and implanting what Adam lost, a holy taste, inclination or propensity to a godly life. It is instead, and theoretically, regeneration *seriatim* of a chain of exercises. In times of deep feeling and of moral crises, leading choices and volitions are rectified. Then and there the change may be marked, but it is only of a single act, or of a section and department of conduct. The man total is not so wrought on, as that the work may, even in figure, be called a new creature, and so lacks striking characteristics.

A change of mere volitions can not be as labored, and deep, and conspicuous, as a change in the soul itself, when one is "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." This new kind of regeneration is more like sanctification, in its taking effect on single acts, and in being a quiet, continuous process. Hence some of the more evangelical in their tendencies in the liberal school have confounded it with sanctification, as Sears in his treatise on this doctrine. With such the new life starts from some higher and more special human endeavor, and is a growth, and so regeneration is life-long in its accomplishment.

Moreover, this change in our day, in its aggregate manifestation in many communities, seems easier and lighter to the aged in our churches, because the human agency in it is made so prominent, in contrast with its manifestation in earlier days. The man himself, by a specific and most determined choice,

makes God and holiness his supreme portion, and so gives a right character to his life. This is a regeneration of volitions rather than of souls, and of actions rather than of agents; and is wrought by man and not God. Men are moved up to this high resolve, under the impression, distinct or vague, according to the temper of the workman, that the resolution is the constituting act, by which they enter in among the children of God. This must seem an easy and light thing to those who have been accustomed to regard the great change from sin to holiness as a new creation, divinely and supernaturally accomplished.

The philosophy and theology that we have been considering obscure, of necessity, and quite do away with the distinction between regeneration and conversion. Failing to make this distinction, the supernatural agency of God in constituting one a Christian is overlooked, and the man is supposed and left to work the change, except so far as the ordinary aid of God may coöperate.

The Scriptures so far ascribe the work to God, as to call the Christian "his workmanship"; and they so far mark it supernatural as to call it a new creation. This we understand to be the restoration of that holy disposition toward God that Adam lost. Receiving it is, we suppose, "putting on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," after the manner in which Adam was created in the image of God. Thus the kingdom of God, as leaven, or a grain of mustard seed, is divinely started in the natural heart. And it is an instructing fact, that all, or nearly all, the passages in the Bible, in which this superhuman change is spoken of, are in the passive voice, showing that the subject of the change is so far not an agent in working it, but the subject of it.

Conversion, no less a Scripture doctrine, on the other hand, is man's work, and he is obligated to do it, and no agency but his own can do it. The heart being thus prepared to bear the fruits of the Spirit, the man must convert or turn himself from the old way and produce these fruits. He alone can do his repenting, believing, loving and hating, as a Christian. These are acts personal to himself, and can not lie in the range of God's agency. The man must exercise his own submission, trust, hope, etc. These new and holy feelings and exercises

and purposes, for the furnishing of which regenerating grace has prepared the soul, are often called the "new heart," and the man is commanded to make it to himself. In the limitations here given to conversion, as moral and holy exercises coming out of the "new creature," the man does make his new heart; no other being can make it for him, since every one must perform his own moral actions, which, as holy acts, are in the Scriptures called the new heart. But these exercises are prepared for, and consequent on, the new creation, that, as an act of God, has preceded.

To make the Scriptures self-consistent, secure for God his agency and work in this change from death to life, and impose on man his part and duty, this distinction between regeneration and conversion must be preserved. Not having preserved it, we have reason to fear that a great many self-made Christians have been drawn into the church. They are Christians by volition, by resolution, by solemn, and it may be, agonizing purpose. Their religious life is consequently one of impulses.

Honest, sincere, earnest, flattered with the notion that they can constitute themselves Christians, they make occasional struggles to rise to the level of their spiritual ideal. Excitement only can carry them up to the point to which it first carried them in a supposed regeneration. Having no root in themselves, they endure but for a while. They are misled by their teaching, and are as good Christians as their theory legitimately makes. All such need a soul as well as a series of exercises, and regeneration as well as conversion. Falling from grace and second conversion are terms fit and indispensable to describe the experiences of this kind of religious life, terms that can have no logical or theological place in our old and common creed.

This distinction between regeneration and conversion we think it very important to make and use, that we may preserve the unity of our faith. They are two points and not one, and neither covers the other, or states the whole truth without the other. The two points indicate the two agents in bringing a sinner from death to life; they show what each does, and which work precedes in the order of nature, and which follows. Much discussion is unfortunate and obscure and wasted by fail-



ing to discriminate on this doctrine. Authors and preachers are misunderstood. One calls all the work of the two agents regeneration, and seems to leave nothing for the man to do. Another calls it all conversion, and seems to exclude divine and supernatural agency, while yet another reverses the natural order of action by the two agents, and gets holy acts before he gets the holy heart, a process of producing grapes from thorns, and clean things from unclean.

But, on the theory we have been considering, that the soul is merely a series of exercises, this distinction would be a fiction; this confusion must run on; and so man must be left to do the act that constitutes one a Christian, so imparting to that transaction all the imperfection and uncertainty that pertains to the ordinary works of man, under only the ordinary aid and superintendence of God.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### SHORT SERMONS.

"And Isaac loved Esau, because he did eat of his venison; but Rebekah loved Jacob."—*Genesis* xxv. 28.

It seems to be a small matter, at first, that each parent had a favorite child in this family, but the consequences are great and sorrowful, showing

#### THE SIN OF HAVING, AND THE EVIL OF BEING, A FAVORITE CHILD.

The subject, thus given us by the text, is not so foreign or obsolete, as it is ancient, to us. This sin and evil are both modern and common. Sometimes a parent declares this favoritism for one child; sometimes it is marked by the food, or dress, or pleasures and indulgences of one of the children; sometimes by the opposing choices of the father and mother; sometimes by the favoring plan that forecasts the life of one child, to the detriment or neglect of the others; and sometimes by the last will and legacies. Thus often brothers and sisters are alienated from each other; houses are divided against themselves, and family feuds are made hereditary. In all which the principle is wrong, and the policy unwise. God has, therefore, caused

to be written out "aforetime and for our learning," a single case of parental partiality, in both its first facts, and in its consequences. Under these two divisions we will study the case.

1. *The Facts.*

Nothing is said of partiality in this family prior to the text, though Esau and Jacob are now about thirty years old. Probably it had been practiced from early childhood, but now was so marked as to become a leading historical feature in the family. Ten years later Esau, alienated from the confidence and sympathies of his mother, marries Canaanitish wives, and she says: "I am weary of my life, because of the daughters of Heth," Esau's wives. If she had loved Esau as much as Jacob, she might have had daughters-in-law more to her liking.

The favoritism runs on, till Isaac seems about to die, and so the will is drawn. He is then one hundred and thirty and seven years old, and his two sons are seventy and seven. The trick, the plot, the treachery of Rebekah, and the crowning of her long struggle, in the matter of the savory meat and the dying blessing, are familiar facts. But what a family scene! An old man, blind, helpless and apparently dying; the wife practicing the basest arts of deception; and one son, a man of four score and venerable, by her aid, putting on deceit as a garment, to gain treacherously his brother's inheritance. Esau discovers the plot, is enraged. His wives and children see and know it! All this is done to secure wealth and power and favor, for one child, to the injury and neglect of another. Death the while seems standing at the door. Do you remember any such family scene, a dying old man, and a scheming wife and mother, intriguing with her favorite child about the will, and the quarrelling sons?

2. *We pass on to notice the consequences.*

"And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him. And Esau said, in his heart: The days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob." A result so natural, inevitable and sinful; and the more natural, as Esau had previously lost his birthright by most unjust means, in which, no doubt, the hand of Rebekah, his mother, was very powerful.

To save his life Jacob flees to a foreign land, and so, as a first fruit of her favoritism and plotting, Rebekah has a murderous son and his strange wives, with her, and her favorite in exile.

The funeral does not come so soon. Isaac revived and lived yet forty-four years, and Esau's anger had time to cool, and his hatred to deepen. Twenty-one years Jacob does not dare go home, and so the brothers do not meet, or their parents see them together. Jacob

lives with his uncle Laban, when, deceived in turn, as to a wife, and deceiving his uncle in business, like his own mother, and watching for the main chance, he gets rich, and then steals away.

In his flight he has occasion to pass through the country of Esau. There is a timid, cold meeting between the brothers, and a partial and formal reconciliation. It is more diplomatic than fraternal, and as between twin brothers it lacks heart. The bitter memories, heart burnings and self-reproach of that interview, after twenty one years' separation, we will not dwell on. There is yet more fruit of the paternal partiality.

So far as we can know the brothers did not meet again till their father's funeral, twenty three years after. What were Rebekah's views then of her favoritism and treachery, what her fears of Esau's anger, and how much comfort and honor and hope she had from this leading policy of her life, we are not told. How the brothers felt or conducted we know not. There is no record of explanations, concessions, or restitution. Hatred remained and stinging recollections, and hot passion had settled into a principle and habit of hostility, as we learn from events following.

Rebekah has her reward in the wealth and preëminence of the favorite son, but how much of self-respect, of joy in her children, or of happy anticipations for them, or for her own lonely, widow's life, we need not inquire.

Isaac is dead. Rebekah dies, and also Esau and Jacob. Has the unhallowed favoritism spent itself, and are the grudges and feuds growing out of it, dead too and buried?

We pass along about two centuries and a half, and is all smooth and pleasant between the descendants of the unwise parents and quarrelling brothers?

"And Moses sent messengers from Kadesh unto the King of Edom, [the tribe of Esau]. Thus saith thy brother Israel . . . . Let us pass, I pray thee, through thy country. . . . And Edom said: Thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword. And the children of Israel said unto him: We will go by the highways, and if I and my cattle drink of thy water, then I will pay for it. I will only, without anything else, go through on my feet. And he said: Thou shalt not go through. And Edom came out against him with much people, and with a strong hand. Thus Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border. Wherefore Israel turned away from him."

This is three hundred and seven years after the trick and treachery of Rebekah with the savory meat, and the implanted feud between her two sons. "Israel turned away" to those terrible wan-

derings of thirty and nine years in the desert, before entering Canaan. The favorite child and the partial mother have their reward.

We pass on more than four hundred years, and find Israel under David slaying eighteen thousand of the children of Esau. "For six months did Job remain there with all Israel, until he had cut off every male in Edom."

After a hundred and fifty years more the children of Esau again revolted from the rule of the sons of Jacob, and ten thousand of them were slain, and as many more thrown down the rocks of Petra.

But recovering a national name and spirit afterward they joined with Nebuchadnezzar in the siege of Jerusalem. Hence the bitter prayer against them in the 137th Psalm. This act of Esau, and this prayer of the house of Jacob are the last account the Bible gives of the two brothers and their descendants together.

Thus for about twelve hundred years, this parental partiality showed its fruit. For so long time the plot of Rebekah worked evil between her twin sons. Later record, sacred and profane, shows the decrease of the children of Esau under the persecuting hatred of Jacob, till about the opening of the Christian era, when the name and race of Esau are lost to history. So much did it cost to love one child to partiality, and to the neglect and abuse of the other.

---

"O that there were such a heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and their children forever."—*Deut. v. 29.*

God has long had a beloved people in Egypt, but, in the circumstances, he could not give them a code of laws, and an order of life. So with great power he brings them out of Egypt, and they are now as far as Sinai toward their home. Valley and hill, ravine and plain are covered with them there, and the Law is given, the law moral and ceremonial, social, private and international. It is a sublime sight, for here are a people of one blood, with one God, one religion, and one destiny.

It is a time for God to reveal himself in a declaration of principles, and the declaration is made, by the text, in four points.

1. *The intense compassion of God is declared.*

We recall his majesty and glory at Sinai, as the legislator and governor. The scenery surrounding is rough and wild. The mountain is burning, smoking and trembling. Yet the leading desire of God is, love for this people: "That it might be well with them."

The words are full of sympathy, tenderness and anxiety. A father's heart is in them.

2. *Divine benevolence, for its best exercise, must take the form of law.*

It is a human notion and a weakness to let those we love, and should control, have always their own way. Some parents, and all non-resistants and anti-prison theorists indulge in this folly. But not so God. He loves man too truly for this: "Keep my commandments always," "that it may be well with them." Our sinfulness, weakness, ignorance, and desire for happiness, necessitate the law of God. The highest benevolence, the purest philanthropy takes the form of the most careful legislation, and Sinai shows as true a love for man as Calvary.

3. *God would secure human happiness through the free action of man.*

No almighty, irresistible force compels man to virtue and happiness. "O that there were such a heart in them." All the means of grace assume our freedom, so that our spiritual joys and our salvation are in our own seeking and keeping, the grace of God being always offered and aiding.

4. *The well-being of children is wrapped up in the obedience and disobedience of their parents.*

"Keep all my commandments . . . that it might be well with . . . their children forever." And so "for the fathers' sake" the children of Achan and of the drunkard have woes, while Samuel and Timothy enter into mercies prepared of God for them through devout mothers in Israel. There are laws of physical and moral inheritance, and parents constitute their children heirs by a kind of necessity, and without any last will and testament.

From all which we see :

1. God has a peculiar tenderness for sinful men.
2. The Law of God is not the stern and severe code that some call it.
3. Lost men destroy themselves despite the compassion and good endeavors of God to the contrary.
4. Parental disobedience to God is cruelty to children.

## ARTICLE IX.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

1.—*Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*. By JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D., Vol. II. The Gospel of Mark, by J. P. Lange, D.D., edited by W. G. T. Shedd, D.D. The Gospel of Luke by J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., edited by Philip Schaff, D.D., and Rev. Charles C. Starbuck. Royal 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

THE full year which has elapsed since the issue of the first volume of the American edition of this work, has given ample opportunity to test its merits, and to determine whether the cordial welcome which it generally received was well grounded and bestowed. Our own trial of the volume, thus laid before the public, has been satisfactory. We have found it a real help toward a richer possessing of the treasure stored in the word of God. We do not mean by this that, here and there, we have not come upon some paragraph which is, in our judgment, fanciful or otherwise superfluous. The German mind is not like ours in some particulars. We occasionally observe, for instance, both in the chief conductor of this *Bibelwerk* and in his American editor in chief, a tinge of mysticism, and an over refinement of interpretation, which fails to carry our more matter of fact common sense along with it. We are hardly used, moreover, to that freedom of illustration, in a staid and critical work like this, which brings in a long quotation from Professor Schaff's diary, descriptive of Lee's invasion of Pennsylvania in 1863, to explain "the wars and rumors of wars" in Matthew xiv. So, it is more pleasing than altogether important, to be informed in the present volume, that the American editor hopes to see his transatlantic co-laborers this summer (1865) which hope, we are subsequently informed (Feb. 1866) was only partially gratified. This gossip kind of footnotes and postscripts in a commentary, on the Holy Scriptures, is not quite American. Still, it may have a use in showing our public more fully how thoroughly this great work is entitled to their confidence as representing and reproducing the views of the eminent scholars abroad, with whom we are thus forming a more intimate acquaintance. We gather from these confidences that both Drs. Lange and Schaff are highly gratified with the marked success of this publication on our side the ocean, to which we join the hearty expression of our own satisfaction.

The very thorough consideration which was given to the Gospel of St. Matthew, enables the editors to dispose of the next two Evangelists in a single volume of some fifty pages less than the preceding. Dr. Shedd has brought out St. Mark's Gospel with characteristic neatness and good judgment. Whether following the original author or his own excellent taste, we observe less discursiveness of remark, and less amplification of reference to other commentators, than in the other Gospels. The third Evangelist was committed by Dr. Lange to the distinguished scholar and preacher of Holland, Dr. Van Oosterzee. In this edition, his labors are reproduced through the joint editorship of Drs. Schaff and Starbuck, the latter accomplishing the much larger part of the work. The same general plan is followed by each of these gentlemen. We have thus unity with much variety of treatment, the scholarship and piety of many eminent minds conspiring to illustrate, with their best resources, the sacred books of our faith. This conception, faithfully carried out, can not fail to result in a commentary, upon the whole Bible, of hitherto unrivalled attractiveness and value in our language.

It rather increases the interest and value of this undertaking, that the American editors freely dissent from the views of the original authors, wherever they find occasion so to do. In the exposition of St. Luke, we notice several of these instances, the most important of them relating to the premillennial theory of interpretation which Van Oosterzee appears to accept, but which his editor rejects. It is very instructive thus to note the different views maintained by scholars of this grade; and to have a thesaurus like this of high biblical criticism within reach is invaluable, not for dispensing with, but for stimulating independent study. The work has advanced far enough now to justify us in saying that every church should forthwith order a set of this commentary for its pastor's library. The entire series will be a heavier tax than most clergymen can afford to assume. But to a congregation it would be an imperceptible burden. It will be a biblical library in itself, as unique as it is solidly and permanently useful.

2.—*Ecce Homo: A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ.*  
Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866.

A BOOK of great apparent candor, insinuating itself into the mind, so that if it were possible it would deceive the very elect. We have concluded that it is the bold and ingenious attack of one of the disciples of the Paine school of sceptics, upon the fundamental truths of religion. In denies Christ's divinity, rejects inspiration, takes great



liberty with the Gospels, and seeks to reconstruct the narratives of Christ's "Life and Work."

"Ecce Homo," said Pilate, as he presented the thorn-crowned, scourged Nazarene to the view of the Jews. This author's view of Christ seems to us as inadequate as Pilate's was. He "found no fault in him," and yet delivered him up to be crucified, and so with this author. Either Christ was divine, or he was a self-deceived enthusiast. He ought, therefore, either to be worshipped or rejected. But this man professes to do neither, though we believe the influence of the book will be to lead to Christ's rejection.

Any amount of patronizing epithets may be found in this volume, but no reverence, no faith, no true recognition of the relations of man to God. The author even ridicules the idea of being a believer, in the evangelical sense of the word; calls such persons "the pauper class of the New Jerusalem." A man, woman or child that can read the author's version of the case of the woman taken in adultery, without indignation at the low-lived views of the writer, must be a remarkable person. We have no expectation that the forth-coming (?) volume will be any more satisfactory than the present.

3.—*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ Historically and Logically Reviewed.* By RICHARD W. DICKINSON, D.D. 12mo. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1866.

ON the basis of the credibility of the New Testament, this is a complete defence of the resurrection of our Lord. The whole narrative is carefully sifted, the seeming discrepancies are harmonized, the objections to the fact are fairly disposed of, the whole subject is set in a clear and convincing light. There is no way to meet this argument but to deny the truthfulness of the record. With such cavillers, and they are growing numerous, the author does not deal. And, in truth, if we are to be continually going over that ground, as preliminary to the setting forth of a Scripture fact or doctrine, we shall soon be in as awkward a case as the earlier historians, who felt called upon to begin whatever particular narrative they undertook, with an account of the creation of the world. The "pure theists" have not yet pushed us quite to that extremity.

Dr. Dickinson, it will be seen, stands at a far remove from the Renan school with whom the resurrection of Jesus is only the amiable fiction of an imaginative love. He believes the fact, and in a vigorous style he maintains it, and shows its Christian relations and applications. The ten chapters of the treatise are all comprised within 142 pages, thus combining brevity with adequate

fulness. The volume is well suited for popular circulation, to which we commend it.

- 4.—*Life of Benjamin Silliman, M.D., LL.D., chiefly from his Manuscript Reminiscences, Diaries and Correspondence.* By GEO. P. FISHER, Professor in Yale College. 2 Volumes. pp. 407, 408. New York: Scribner & Co. 1866.

THE life of Benjamin Silliman is the history of chemistry in America. Previous to 1804, chemistry was taught in this country only at Cambridge and Philadelphia, and at those places was taught as a branch of some other department rather than as a science by itself. In Europe, Lavoisier and Black had securely laid the foundations of modern chemistry, and Chaptal and Sir Humphrey Davy were rearing a superstructure worthy of the admiration of their masters and departed fellow laborers. Dr. Dwight, with characteristic foresight, early saw the necessity of a department in chemistry in Yale College, and, as early as 1798, obtained a vote from the trustees "that a Professorship of Chemistry and Natural History be instituted in this college as soon as the funds shall be sufficiently productive to support it."

But who could teach it? There was no one in America who could give to chemistry the character due to a department, and the disadvantages that would result from the appointment of a foreigner, were obvious. Dr. Dwight "saw no way but to select a young man worthy of confidence, and allow him time, opportunity, and pecuniary aid, to enable him to acquire the requisite means and skill, and wait for him until he should be prepared to begin." He selected Benjamin Silliman, a graduate of Yale, and in 1802, Mr. Silliman was appointed Professor of Chemistry in Yale College. Mr. Silliman, having occupied the position of tutor since 1798, was at this time a law student in New Haven, and was soon after admitted to the Connecticut Bar. He soon went to Philadelphia, and commenced his first studies in chemistry. Of course his means of information were much limited, chemistry being taught there as a branch of the instruction in Medicine, and not as a science of itself. There was no better place, however, short of Europe, and the prospective remuneration at Yale would hardly sanction such an undertaking.

In 1804, Mr. Silliman commenced his labors as Professor of Chemistry, with the senior class, his first being a lecture on the history and progress of chemistry. Among the senior class were Hon. John C. Calhoun, Rev. Dr. Marsh, and Rev. John Pierpont.

A quotation from Mr. Silliman's diary reveals the feelings with which students approached the nucleus of a laboratory, previous to 1804. "There was an air of mystery about the room, and we entered it with awe increasing to admiration after we had seen something of the apparatus and the experiments." These illustrations being given mainly upon topics of Philosophy, "there was an air pump, an electrical machine, a wheeling table, a telescope of medium size, a quadrant, a set of models for illustrating the mechanical powers, a condensing fountain with jets d'eau, a theodolite, and a magic lantern, the wonder of Freshmen." Truly, the mysterious air and poverty of apparatus were wonderfully multiplied, elsewhere, after leaving Yale College in 1804!

In 1818, Dr. Silliman commenced the publication of "Silliman's Journal of Science," a work too well known to need mention here. A similar work had been begun sometime before by Dr. Archibald Bruce of New York, but after reaching four numbers, was abandoned on account of the ill health of its able author. "The Journal was often obliged to maintain a dubious struggle for existence," but an effort having been made by a rival publication to destroy it, the friends of science came forward and secured for it a patronage, by which it has since been enabled to do so much and so well. In the third year of its existence, Mr. Everett, in the *North American Review*, spoke of it as a "work which does honor to American science." Mr. Silliman held the position of Professor of Chemistry until 1853, although he continued for two years longer, to give chemical lectures in the College.

Benjamin Silliman was not a genius, but he was what was much better, an honest, capable, industrious, and Christian man. He began with nothing, and made chemistry in this country what it is. How faithfully he labored, the present condition of chemistry, as well as the reputation of many of his pupils for scientific knowledge, clearly shows.

Prof. Fisher has done a good work in compiling this life of his friend and instructor, and will receive the thanks of all lovers of sound learning and good sense. That "the reader will see Professor Silliman as he was," is evident even from a cursory perusal, while a more careful reading only confirms the statement.

5.—*Commentary on the Gospels*: Intended for popular use. By D. D. WHEDON, D. D. Luke—John. 12mo. pp. 422. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

WE hail all such evangelical effort to simplify, explain and diffuse the Scriptures among the masses. Such unpretending, yet

really very valuable volumes, are our best defense against the scepticism and irreligion of the age, and that scholarly, insinuating and undermining influence that we import from many of the German critics. This work follows one on Matthew and Mark, and gives promise of successors through the New Testament, and probably the Old. The issues are in the interest of the Methodist Episcopal church, and of course partake of their doctrinal peculiarities.

The remarks on Peter's apostasy will indicate the doctrinal tone of the volume. *When thou art converted*: "From the apostasy. That re-conversion he doubtless needed to save him from damnation. The salvation of an old conversion will not survive a complete apostasy. A new repentance, faith, and conversion are necessary." We could hope, though probably vainly, that the author here uses conversion in sharp distinction from regeneration. We suppose that one regeneration, being the act of God, will serve a man forever. Conversion, being the act of man, may need much repeating and repairing, like other human works.

This volume reminds us strikingly in form, method and style of Barnes' Notes, and will be eminently serviceable to the large communion that rejoices in the name of its distinguished author.

6.—*Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries; and of the discovery of the Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa. With Maps and Illustrations.* 1858—1864. By DAVID and CHARLES LIVINGSTON. 8vo. pp. 638. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1866.

MR. LIVINGSTON laid the reading public under great obligations by his former volume on Africa, and by this one they are very much increased. He has a passion for this kind of adventure, controlled by a deep Christian and philanthropic purpose. He has some knowledge of natural science, and combined it also in his company, so far as to make serviceable observations on the natural history of these new regions. He possesses a quick and comprehending eye, as a traveller, and an easy pen for record. His style has not the finish of Dr. Kane's, but is good for his purpose, and we forget his sentences in our interest in his sayings. It has been his rare fortune to traverse regions previously unexplored, and so add a rich life to his volumes. We are indebted to no one, probably, more than to Mr. Livingston, for a series of surprises on the river systems, productions, resources and capabilities of Central Africa. His first volume, issued about eight years before this one, deranged wonderfully our theories and supposed facts about this interesting region. The present works settles us in the happy conclusion that a new and

very productive and inviting continent is about to be added to the world of commerce, civilization and Christianity, in place of our theoretic Africa of sand and jungle and pestilent solitude.

This territory, specially, opened up to us on the Zambesi and its affluents, is populous and fertile, and needs but the forces of a Christian home to make it healthy. Some of the staples of trade are native to these regions, and have so long been kept from the marts of the world only by that scourge of the nations, the slave trade. On this the author makes some shocking and shameful revelations, while his work is one of the severest blows that the inhuman system has ever received.

The exposure in regard to the Portugese, in their relations to the eastern coast of Africa, is very discreditable to them. They have had such control of about seventeen hundred miles of coast as to shut off trade with it from the rest of the world, and confine it mostly to slaves. This narrative will hasten the breaking up of this monopoly in iniquities, and start new and stimulating, elevating kinds of trade with the native tribes.

This book is a valuable contribution to geography, and will aid in solving some of the long studied problems of Africa. It has, moreover, all the thrilling incident of fiction, with all the comfort and profit of real fact, and for this reason is worthy a place in every intelligent family, and specially where there are young children. It is worth a whole alcove of novels and fictitious travels. The enterprising house of the Harpers is doing good service in multiplying such books. Can no better form be given to its map than this expaunding and contracting one of ten foldings? The use of this one is a very annoying process, and we suspect, from our own experience, that it is but little used for this reason.

7.—*Battle Echoes, or, Lessons from the War.* By GEORGE B. IDE, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1866.

WE have here eleven Sermons called out by the Rebellion. Direct, positive and earnest, they may serve as a sample of the Northern pulpit during our national struggle. They partake of the popular, newspaper discussions of the times, when they were preached, and as such will serve as a good condensed record for future reference. The sermon-literature of the war must be very voluminous in MSS. Some of it will work into print among personal friends, and by and by another Thornton will give to the libraries a choice and permanent volume, with rich annotations: *The Pulpit on the Great Rebellion.*

- 8.—*Short Sermons to News Boys.* By CHARLES LORING BRACE. New York: Charles Scribner. 1866.

NEWS BOYS have bodies, and so the good people of New York have built lodging-houses for them. They have souls, and so Mr. Brace has made them some short, simple, practical, interesting sermons. Sabbath school talkers, who retail stories without point or moral, may here learn how to be wide-awake without being sensational or theatrical.

- 9.—*The Toilers of the Sea.* A Novel. By VICTOR HUGO. New York: Harpers. 1866.

THE interest which this book awakens does not arise from its story or plot. There is but little of this, and what there is is not especially pleasing. The persons involved are not of a kind to excite much sympathy or admiration. There is but little complication to the machinery. Artistically there are grave defects, as the very long and minute account of the single-handed rescue of the engine of the *Durande* from her wreck among the Channel rocks. So the lovers of Caudray and Deruchette are narrated with a meagreness quite disproportioned to the space given to much inferior subjects of interest. M. Hugo does not seem to have an eye for symmetry and proportion as was glaringly manifest in his *Les Misérables*. His novels are as out of balance as some old trees which have taken the wind, for generations, on only one side. But this, as his other books of imagination, is full of the power which genius alone can command. It is a study in anatomy, the anatomy of man's character and life; of nature in the most variant moods; the anatomy of every thing which the author touches. He will not leave his subject, be it what it may, until he has taken it in pieces with painful minuteness. He analyzes almost to death, whether it be a human feeling, a plant, a sea phenomenon, or what else, which has arrested his notice. His microscopic studies are like a statistic's exhibit; but then he throws around them the purple lights of his idealizing spirit, and you hardly know whether you are reading philosophy or poetry. He makes everything live. He puts a personal will into the sea, the air, the engine of a steamboat; it is all invested with a sort of human intelligence and purpose, and you feel that a great battle is going on around you, of which you can hardly call yourself a mere spectator. You care but little for the individual fortunes or misfortunes of the *dramatis personæ*: but you feel that you have been conversant with a curious medley of out of the way specimens, from which possibly some useful knowledge may result.

- 10.—*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. V., VI. pp. 474, 495.

It is beginning to be painful to remember that we are coming so near to the last of Mr. Froude's volumes. We could wish that so original an explorer among the records of England's past would continue his researches and his masterly and delightful embodiment of the results, not to the death of Elizabeth merely, but to the life and reign of Victoria, if such a thing were possible in a single life. The fall of Wolsey was in September 1529; and Elizabeth died early in 1603. Out of a period of seventy four years Mr. Froude has made his eight goodly volumes. At this rate it would take twenty eight additional volumes to reach the present time.

The two volumes under notice, commence with Henry's last directions before his death, in January, 1547, delivered verbally to Lord Hertford and Sir William Paget, making provision for the conducting of the government until his son and heir, Edward, should attain to his majority, to the death of the "Bloody Mary," in November, 1558. Very memorable were these eleven years in the annals of England and of Europe. For conspiracies, and intrigues, and deep animosities, and fierce encounter of great and mighty religious parties, and rise and fall of illustrious men and women, and the shedding of blood, both of low and high degree; very few periods of equal length in the annals of the world can bear comparison with it. These volumes are marked by the same peculiar excellences which we have noticed in those that preceded. It has been supposed that the world in general, or at least the republic of letters, knew all that was ever likely to be known of Somerset's ambition and Northumberland's great conspiracy, with its tragic termination, and Gardiner and Bonner and Cranmer, and the persecutions under Mary. But Mr. Froude draws out the main facts, with which we have long been familiar, and illustrates those facts by so many incidents which are like the delicate lights and shadows of a great picture, that many old things seem strangely new. To one journeying in this leafy month of June amid the soft beauties and peaceful homes of England's landscape, it is difficult to believe that a land so beautiful and quiet and happy can ever have been the scene of such agonies and horrors, and (should we not add) such heroic and Christian magnanimities as these volumes exhibit. These magnanimities are the mighty lights which break in upon the awful darkness of human history. Man is no where else so great as in sorrow and suffering. Nothing else in the life of Cranmer was so great as



that sublime prayer and abjuration of the Pope at his death, when Cole had preached his funeral sermon in St. Mary's church, Oxford. The extract which Mr. Froude gives, v. 437, from a tract in circulation among the Protestants when suffering under Mary's persecutions, exhibits a spirit which was not surpassed in the apostolic age. For example, speaking of the cross: "O profitable instrument! O excellent exercise, that can not be spared in a Christian life! with what alacrity of mind, with what desirous affection, with what earnest zeal, ought we to embrace this incomparable jewel, this sovereign medicine, this comfortable cup of tribulation." In reading the frightful record of this dark and bloody period, we are amazed again for the thousandth time, that such a heart could have dwelt in the breast of a woman. We would gladly believe, with our author, that Mary's deep personal sorrows made her insane, and so prepared her to be the dupe and tool of her spiritual advisers, and especially of Reginald Pole, or, in other words, as we should paraphrase it, the embodiment in them of the spirit of the papacy, always one and the same.

Such volumes as these of Mr. Froude should be much read and studied in our day. They make us feel that, with all our high sounding self-laudation, the piety of the present day is comparatively a soft and silken thing, knowing little of the cross, save as it surmounts the spires of our churches, or is embellished with flowers, or adorns the neck of beauty.

We must profess our admiration of the uncut condition of these exceedingly elegant volumes. There is a peculiar pleasure in cutting the leaves. It makes us feel that the first reading is ours. It is like standing under the tree and eating peaches gathered by our own hand.

- 11.—*Prophecy Viewed in Respect to its Distinctive Nature, Special Functions and Proper Interpretation.* By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D. D., Principal of the Free Church College, Glasgow; Author of "Typology of Scripture," "Ezekiel and the Book of His Prophecy," etc. pp. 524. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

THIS is a new and revised edition of a work first published several years ago. It exhibits sound learning, skill in exegesis, and clear, well poised judgment. The treatise consists of two parts, the first upon the "Investigation of Principles," and the second upon the "Application of Principles to Past and Prospective Fulfillment of Prophecy." This, it will be observed, is very comprehensive, covering the whole ground. The writer does not hold with those who "have demonstrated with mathematical certainty" as they claim, "that the present Louis Napoleon is the last, the culminating embod-

iment of Anti-Christ," and that the return of the Jews to Palestine, the building of their new temple, and the second advent of Christ are events just at hand. Dr. Fairbairn employs the failure of such visionary predictions with great effect against those who have adventured them. It is a fact to be greatly deplored that the writing of such dreamers, good and true men, nevertheless, has done so much to envelope the whole subject of prophecy in a painful cloudiness, tending even to weaken the popular faith in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. This work is of great value in contributing to restore the subject to its proper place.

- 12.—*A History of New England. From the Discovery by Europeans to the Revolution of the Seventeenth Century.* Being an abridgement of his History of New England during the Stuart Dynasty. By JOHN GORHAM PALFREY. In two volumes. pp. xx. 408, xii. 425. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866.

THE Riverside Press is doing most excellent service to the republic of letters in the series of standard historical works it is sending forth. It gave us quite recently Punchard's two volumes on Congregationalism, of the value of which we can hardly speak too highly. Froude's incomparable volumes are nearly completed; and here we have two volumes exhibiting all the unique Riverside beauties, and comprising a history of profound interest and value, of which we can only say now, that it is marked by all the peculiar excellences of the larger work of which it is an abridgement, much research, elegant scholarship, and a happy faculty of clear and concise delineation. Perhaps we will refer to it again.

- 13.—*Only a Woman's Heart.* By ADA CLARE. New York: M. Doolady. 1866.

A RATHER clever combination of improbabilities and impossibilities; how a brilliant, dreamy, warm hearted girl, and a fighting girl withal, literally a fighting girl among her school mates, was a reformer in the seminary, banishing, by her influence, duplicity and sundry other ignoble qualities; how she fell in love with an actor, and met with mortification, and despaired and hoped, and was married to him at last, and both were wrecked, and both died in the boat in which they had escaped from the ship; with the moral tone good on the whole.

- 14.—*Roebuck.* A Novel. New York: M. Doolady. 1866.

PERHAPS this is as good as most of the works of the same kind at the present day. Perhaps it is better than most of them. And per-

haps it does the best that can be done in the line of its particular object, which is, to defend secessionism, a forlorn task. We entertain a poor opinion of the novels of our day. Scott and Cooper are severe classics in comparison.

- 15.—*The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, afterwards Mistress Milton*. New York: M. W. Dodd. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1866.

THIS is a delightful little volume. We thought so when we read it years ago, and the feeling is only intensified after a second perusal. The quaint and simple style, the antique spelling, and the old time phraseology, all combine to carry us back two hundred years or more, to the days of the Cavalier and the Roundhead, and what is better still, to the days of John Milton.

The book is written in the form of a diary, and in addition to the public events touched upon, the narrative is full of interest. There is always a strange charm in anything which throws light on the more private and domestic life of an author, or any one who has made himself famous, and so, when, in the "Journal" of "Sweet Moll" we see Milton at home and surrounded by his friends, our fascination is complete.

The "younge wife" tells us of "his easie Flow of Mirthe, his Manners unaffectedlie cheerfull, his Voice musicall, his Person beautiful, his Habitt gracefull, his Hospitalitie naturall to him, his Purse, countenance, Time, Trouble, at his Friend's Service," etc. We love to see him ere his days of darkness envelop him, and while his eyes yet undimmed follow with delight the "joyfulle happy wife" calling her pet names and bidding her never fear about her housekeeping, "for", he says, "if I find thy Weeklie Bills the heavier, 'twill be but to write another Book, and make a better Bargain for it than I did for the last."

And so we leave the Poet, whose sublime strains have oftentimes awed and thrilled us, feeling nearer to him than ever before.

- 16.—*History of the Peace: Being a History of England from 1816 to 1854*. With an Introduction, 1800 to 1815. By HARRIET MARTINEAU. Vol. IV. pp. xii. 665. Boston: Walker, Fuller & Company. 1866.

THIS last is not the least interesting or least valuable of Miss Martineau's volumes. It embraces a period of nineteen years, from 1835 to 1854. The fact that the author lived at the time of the events described, and in the midst of them, was no small advantage. This is apparent in the enthusiasm and glow of her pages.

She delineates with graphic power all the important incidents of the period, political and social; and, we think, where there was room for party bias, or social prejudice, with singular impartiality and soundness of judgment. This is great praise. The first impression made, in glancing over the contents of this volume, is of the great importance of English politics. This is always true. No single year passes that is not characterized by the discussion of some question of the gravest interest, requiring the wisdom and experience of the highest and most matured statesmanship. Hence the same men are found in the House of Commons for a whole generation; the Peels and Cobdens and Brights and Gladstones. England would as soon think of burning her ships as of dispensing with the services of such men. And so it is a matter of stern necessity, almost of self-preservation, more than of British constancy that a man may safely enter upon a career of politics as a life-long profession; while with us it is not to be ascribed to any peculiar fickleness of ours, so much as to the absence of questions of vast moment, involving the life of the nation and demanding profound statesmanship, that we have been so ready to exchange a man who has had a ten years' experience for one who has had no experience at all. Integrity is the quality most needed in our politicians, and the quality hardest to be found. When our ship of state founders it will be for lack of this.

Miss Martineau commences this last volume with an account of the condition of Ireland from 1835 to 1840—bad enough—and a discussion of various theories which were confidently propounded as to what was needed for the regeneration of that unhappy country. She disposes of most of these theories, but we doubt if she reaches the true solution of the difficulty. Mistakes and wrongs on the part of British statesmen there doubtless were, but the grand difficulty, and which must have been utterly insuperable to the wisest statesmanship, was popery and Daniel O'Connell. Poor O'Connell! One of the most brilliant of men, magnificent to look at, an orator of surpassing eloquence, and wielding an almost unlimited influence with his countrymen, who believed that God had raised him up to be their deliverer, and make them a separate and great nation, yet destitute of a single particle of patriotism or honesty, trained up by the Jesuits, a most wily and unscrupulous Jesuit himself; talking eloquently and even with tears, of justice and philanthropy, and liberty to the slave, in Exeter Hall and elsewhere. Yet "a middleman, pocketing three times as much rent from a squalid peasantry as he paid to the head landlord; while also his own peasantry were in 'a lost, untutored, and neglected condition.'" He was a gigantic demagogue, agitator and impostor. He gave continual uneasiness

and alarm to every English administration for many years, and deluded and mocked his miserable fellow Irishmen, living in splendor all the while on the money which they gave as freely as we have seen money given in our own country for the liberation of Ireland during the months that are past. His last years were the fitting close of such a life. When in 1843 he got up his series of "monster meetings" for repeal, culminating with that at Tara, where the attendance was variously estimated at from five hundred thousand to two millions, for the first time in his life he was seriously alarmed, finding that he had raised a spirit which he could neither control nor guide, and besought his countrymen with agony to abstain from outrage and violence, and was only too glad to escape from the terrible rising tempest by aid of the government he had so long maligned, when by proclamation it forbid the proposed Sunday monster meeting at Clontarf, and all similar assemblies. The apartments assigned to O'Connell in the Richmond Penitentiary in Dublin, as a conspirator, were very different from the palace he had pretended to dream of in the same beautiful city. Still worse, if possible, than the sentence which confined him to prison, was the decree of the Peers reversing the judgment of the lower court, and opening his prison doors, because it deprived him of a martyr's crown. Thenceforward Daniel O'Connell was a broken down, dispirited, miserable old man. We saw him in a great meeting in Exeter Hall in 1846 for the repeal of capital punishment, enveloped in a cloak, feeble and haggard and bowed down. We could not hear a single word of his brief speech, although we were on the platform. "Fallen like Lucifer," we said within ourself, "never to rise again." The next year he died in Rome, having grown more and more melancholy to the last, harrassed with the fear of being buried alive, and repeating anxiously the prayers enjoined by his confessor.

We would gladly dwell on the many matters of deep interest so ably treated in this volume; as the accession of that interesting maiden to the British throne just as she had attained her majority, with the universal admiration she speedily excited by her many beautiful and queenly qualities; the dreadful famine; the great anti-corn-law agitation, with its grand result, total repeal; the brilliant career, tragic death, and character of Sir Robert Peel; etc., etc.; but our space will not permit.

On one important point we are compelled to differ with the author. Miss Martineau thinks the Dissenters made a mistake in opposing and defeating the education clauses of Sir James Graham's Factory Bill in 1842. We think otherwise. That England was suffering badly then, and is suffering badly still for lack of a system of public

schools is most true. But Sir James Graham's Bill was so framed as to put the proposed system of national education into the hands and under the control of the clergy of the Established church. The clergy of that narrow and intolerant church would not consent to any thing else, and the great bodies of religious dissenters, the Independents, Baptists and Methodists, so largely composing the population of the country, would not of course consent to a system which placed the education of their own children in the hands and under the direction of the priests of that arrogant State church; and so these three great denominations were firmly banded together in a determined opposition to the measure; holding crowded and enthusiastic meetings in every section of the land, dissecting the provisions of the Bill with keenest logic, and sending earnest petitions to Parliament that it might not pass. Two hundred such petitions were presented in a single day, including one from the city of London having fifty five thousand names. This opposition represented not the narrowness and bigotry of the Dissenters, as Miss Martineau would have us think, but their intelligence and self-respect, and proper regard for their own religious principles. Their interest in popular education has been indicated by the very large aggregate sum they have raised by voluntary contribution every year since for the maintenance of day schools in connection with their own places of worship, or else under the united direction of all three denominations. Is it quite a demonstrated point that our own system of public education is absolutely perfect in all its provisions and its actual working? We think not. Some of us remember the day when Christianity had more than a nominal place in our common schools. Great is the change, and our children suffer loss.

- 17.—*The Mystery of Iniquity Unveiled; or Popery Unfolded and Refuted, and its destination shown in the light of Prophetic Scriptures, in Seven Discourses.* By CHANDLER CURTIS. 12mo. pp 417. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1866.

THERE are not enough of this kind of books, nor are they sufficiently read. When Roman Catholic votes are courted by demagogues, and city officials grace papal ceremonies, and city authorities confer special and exclusive and astonishing favors on Romanists, it is time that the mystery of iniquity, that "doeth already work," was unveiled. Very few know the arrogant claims, the false documents, the idolatrous worship, the Jesuitical craft, the bloody intolerance, of this denomination. With no change of principles, but only of policy, from age to age, and ready always to repeat the past when it will be safe, never discovering an error in her-

self, nor a truth out of herself, the same to-day as a thousand years ago, her history should be studied in the light of history and topically.

Mr. Curtis has done his work well. It shows extended and careful research, and is as thoroughly sustained by quoted Romanist authorities as a papist could wish such awful sayings and doings to be. Some may suppose the position and doctrines and practices ascribed here to the papists are ancient only and obsolete. To remove the error of such, Mr. Curtis would have done well to use more freely modern and papal authorities, such as: *Hell Opened*, Dean Alford's *Romanism at Rome*, Tuberville's *Abridgement of Christian Doctrine*, *The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, *Purgatory Opened*, or *The Month of November, Rome Pagan and Papal*, Percey's *Romanism at Rome*, Mendham's *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*, Cotton's *Rhemes and Doway*, and many of the juvenile and Sabbath School Text Books that may be found in abundance in any Catholic bookstore.

Authorities of this kind, modern, in present use, and abundant, would convince the most doubtful that the leopard has not changed his spots since the days of the Leos and Innocents of bloody and vicious memory.

18.—*The Scripture Law of Divorce*. By ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866.

It was full time to write out the Law of the Lord on this subject when the docket of the Supreme Court at one session lately had forty two divorce cases. This is but an index to very common facts, showing a state of things in domestic relations sorrowful and alarming in the extreme. If we can not preserve the family, we can not preserve a society better than the Parisian, and if divorce is allowed to be so easy and common we can not preserve the family. On a question so high in the scale of morals it seems eminently fitting that the Bible, among us, should be the umpire and last source of appeal. Dr. Hovey shows with perfect clearness that the Scriptures allow conjugal infidelity alone to be ground for divorce. By what reasoning and pleading human law repeals, supplements or varies this one law of God, we are not well informed, but in the Christian simplicity of our submission to divine teachings, we presume men have no authority whatever to do it. God allows separation, but no marrying again while one of the original parties survives, unless they have been separated and divorced for adultery, and then only to the innocent party. This treatise is admirable in design, method



and execution. It has the additional worth of being, in a sense, a Result of Council ecclesiastical, convened to give an opinion on an actual case, where a church-member had married a person divorced for other cause than the scriptural one.

19.—*Shakespeare's Delineations of Insanity, Imbecility and Suicide.*

By A. O. KELLOGG, M. D., Assistant Physician, State Lunatic Asylum, Utica, N. Y. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866.

LIKE Jacob's well at Sychar, Shakespeare is a fountain from which successive generations draw, and constantly what is fresh and new. The study and the volumes suggested and worked up by the stimulus of this old author are a perfect wonder.

The three essays composing this neat volume originally appeared in the *American Journal of Insanity*, and are now a reprint improved. They are well executed by a great admirer of him of Avon, having been written by one adapted by profession and circumstances to study this class of Shakespeare's characters. For a topical reading of the great dramatist, these would be eminently serviceable, while they show how carefully and widely and in advance of the physiologists of his day, Shakespeare had observed and studied man in the three points of the Essay.

20.—*The Christian's Daily Treasury. A Religious Exercise for Every Day in the Year.* By EBENEZER TEMPLE, author of "The Domestic Altar," etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866.

THESE four hundred and thirty two pages give a little more than one to each day of the year in the brief, suggestive, scriptural and godly passages that every Christian needs. The topics are practical and of a wide range, and the entire spirit of the book is devout, and is specially adapted to the invalid and aged Christian, and to him whom business hurries with incessant cares, and deprives of full readings and meditations.

21.—*History of the Jewish Church.* Part II. From Samuel to the Captivity. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

THIS is the second series of Dr. Stanley's attempt to popularize biblical history. The same brilliant qualities of style, the same disregard of the literal statements of the sacred record, the same genial and liberal spirit toward extreme views, whether true or false, characterize this, as the preceding volume. We think such treatment of biblical subjects does some minds mischief, and some minds good. Which result preponderates, we hardly know. We fear, the first.

It is dangerous to shake human confidence in the exact truthfulness and trustworthiness of the Bible. And, yet, the lifelikeness of these volumes must give to the study of biblical subjects new fascination, while they certainly impart much useful information.

- 22.—*Revolution and Reconstruction.* Two Lectures delivered in the Law School of Harvard College. By JOEL PARKER, Royall Professor. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866.

THE eminent author, in his regular course of Lectures on Constitutional Law, here discusses the profound and agitating questions of secession and the rebellion; State sovereignty; confederation and the fundamental law of the Union; the suppression of the rebellion, and the powers exercised therein; counter revolution and reconstruction or restoration; the power of the Constitution in bringing about peace; the *status* of the rebel States after the war; organic changes in our government achieved, in progress or contemplated; military necessity and law in their relations to civil law; treason and its punishment; the constitutional guaranty of a republican government in each State, etc.

To the discussion of these topics Judge Parker brings rich resources from colonial and ante-revolutionary times, the eras of the Confederation and of the adoption of the Constitution, together with its interpretation by the framers and first executors. We find here a very scholarly, dignified and genial treatment of these grave questions, the manner being worthy the chair from whence they emanate.

- 23.—*Hope for the Hopeless.* An Autobiography of JOHN VINE HALL. Edited by REV. NEWMAN HALL, LL. B., of Surrey Chapel, London. 12mo. pp. 264. New York: American Tract Society.

THIS is a genuine autobiography of a most remarkable sinner and Christian. If one wishes stirring incidents, romance, narrow escapes, heroism, slavery, emancipation, sin and grace, battles, victory alternating, working, watching, triumph and glory, all in one "hero of the story," this is the book for him. It has sentiment enough for the most ardent, and what is specially to be regarded is, that all the thrilling interest of the volume grows out of facts in the life of a real man. We see little need for writing romances when such life-material may be had, or for reading them, while such books remain unread.

This is a volume for temperance men to read and study. It is full of hints, encouragement, example, and stimulus for them. Fallen mournfully himself, renewed by amazing grace, and made an eminently useful servant of God, Mr. Hall was every way a rare

man. The contents of the third chapter will sell the book to almost any one :

"Temptation resisted. Sermon by Dr. Adam Clark. Return to Maidstone. Relapse. Power of tenderness. The verge of despair. Alternations of success and failure. A ray of hope. Hope; help; defeat. Desperate resolve. Falling and repenting. Fallen again. Rivers of tears. Spirituous liquors abandoned. Strength and joy. Liberation. Divine grace large and free. Family worship. Porter dangerous; abandoned. The last leaven rejected. Sad remembrances."

24.—*The Cross in the Cell*. Boston: American Tract Society, 28 Cornhill.

DR. ADAMS writes remarkable books. This is one of them. It is the story of his successful attempt to reach the heart of a hardened criminal, awaiting execution for murder. It is as interesting as a treatise on theology. No book could be better to put into the hands of an inquirer, whether in a cell or out of it. We are glad that copies of it have already been placed in the Charlestown State Prison, and wish that the same step might be taken with regard to all our public institutions for criminals.

25.—MISCELLANEOUS. The Presbyterian Board is abundant in its excellent issues, some of the larger of which we notice elsewhere. We here add the following: *Robert and Daisy*, *Dick Mason*, *Bob Walker*, *The Power of Gentleness*, *Grace Dermott*, *The Sunny Mountain*, *Minna Crosswell*, *The Evil Tongue*.

---

## ARTICLE XI.

### THE ROUND TABLE.

AN ORTHODOX CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY. Every denomination of national extent and designs needs its Quarterly. Indeed it is quite indispensable, not only for denominational growth, but for all those varied utterances of the Christian scholar, when he would affect widely the more cultivated on questions in theology and morals, civil and social life, literature and the practical topics of the day. We esteem it a favoring providence, therefore, that we had one for our own denomination, established and well under way, when our National Council gave a harmony, unity and oneness of

work to our Congregational body. We were ready and waiting for its programme, and, in truth, were already working out the two leading items in it, creed and polity. We took peculiar satisfaction in seeing that our doctrinal basis, the Westminster Assembly's Catechism, was adopted by the Council unanimously, with a single dissent. This was all we wished or hoped for, and more than many expected from that national body, in the matter of doctrine.

Instead of finding ourselves a "clique," we found that we had been, as we design always to be, the defenders of the faith of that greatest representative body of Congregationalism. We are happy to appeal to our six years' published labors to show that in no important item of faith or polity have we differed from that national platform, and they who may call us a "clique" show that themselves are not on the platform with us and the Council. They are the "clique," and we are of the Congregational nation. We can not now be partizans if we would, for we are with the great whole. Erroneous and unfortunate impressions have been made concerning us to the contrary, but our work is disproving and destroying them, and never faster than during the year past.

Our pages have always been open to the expounders and defenders of our denominational faith, and we have been happy to number not a few among our contributors, whose philosophy and terminology we would not ourselves use, but whom we welcomed as holding and defending the same great truths with us, "for substance of doctrine." And we feel like enlarging this liberty of expression among our writers, since we have seen our National Council declare our fundamental unity by accepting so cordially those ancient and well-understood symbols of our order.

Desires have sometimes been expressed that our editing board might be enlarged or changed to allow a fuller representation to the faith of our church. We acknowledge the tribute of respect paid in these desires, and would cordially reciprocate them, if we could discover any part of our national creed that our Prospectus does not cover. Of course we have not yet published a complete system of theology, with all its philosophies, defenses and illustrations, but we will gladly add any contributions that will farther unfold and appropriate the declared faith of the Council. We would not wish to be instrumental of weakening, or even attacking that faith; and for any in or out of our denomination wishing to publish a different faith and order there are other and able Quarterlies. The very wide range allowed by the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and the *New Englander*, periodicals, in a sense, of our own, makes it unnecessary, as we think it undesirable, to extend our limits to articles not consonant

with our doctrine and order as a denomination. We are too strongly Congregational for that.

Moreover, we wish to ignore, and if possible make obsolete these questions of schools by unifying our denomination, as the work was so auspiciously begun last year. But assuming the existence of divisions, and installing them confessedly in editorial chairs at the same board, might have the effect of inaugurating a strife formally; while the veto power by either party over articles might strike out on both sides the spirit and expression that, innocently blended, could alone give worth and life to a Review.

Such a change would no doubt much increase the editorial power, were it made for either of the Quarterlies mentioned, or for our religious newspapers, but either enterprise can judge whether the change would be desirable and profitable for its own aims and ends as a publication. We know men not a few, who, were schools mentioned, would not class with us, whose coworking we could rejoice in and feel honored by it, and we would gladly help their pens to work out with us the common enterprise of our denomination. Our views and measures are catholic, not clannish, and so are our feelings and sympathies. The interests of Congregationalism are our interests, and we feel that we may justly ask and expect the good will and patronage of the brotherhood; and whoever will make the *Boston Review* any better as the Quarterly of our denomination, we will welcome as the friends of our Puritan faith and polity.

**PROGRESSIVE CRITICISM.** The latest word, in German anti-Christian criticism, gives up the position of the Tübingen school—that the Gospels, and many of the Epistles were constructed some two hundred years after Christ, in order to harmonize the Pauline and Petrine sections of the church; also, the mythical theory of Strauss—that the supernaturalism of Christianity grew up in a later age, out of nebulous tradition, by an exaggerating superstitious tendency, but without a design to deceive. The proofs of the early date of the fourth Gospel as well as the synoptical Evangelists, are growing too clear to allow these theories of their late origin, except by the most violent ignoring of convincing evidence.

Both of the above theories might exempt our Lord and his immediate followers from the charge of perverting truth, of manufacturing facts, for a purpose; by throwing the authorship of the New Testament, for the most part, into perhaps the second and third centuries. But now that this ground is slipping away from under its occupants, and it is becoming necessary to allow the early date of these writings, nothing is left to the critics but to accuse either the apostles or

Christ, or both parties, of wilfully and fraudulently tampering with history. The tendency seems to be, to exempt the first Christians from this falseness at the expense of their Master. Strauss, Renan and others distinctly accuse Christ of planning a deception concerning his own nature, works, mission, and of palming this off upon his earliest followers, that they might propagate this delusion among others, and hand it down the ages, which thing they did in ignorant, honest credulity.

This is a plain issue which men are free to make who dare do it; but they should be consistent in their statements of so grave an indictment, which they by no means are. For example: In their accusations and concessions respecting Jesus, we have these violent contradictions. "Jesus," says Strauss in his latest book, "has developed purely and fully all that relates to love to God and to our neighbor." The admission is frequent and ample that, morally and religiously, he distanced all comparison with his contemporaries. Yet, in his account of his own nature, and in the eschatology which he taught, particularly as to his own office of final Judge of men, Christ is charged with an unjustifiable and utterly groundless self-flattery, with exalting himself above all mankind in a way equivalent to claiming divine powers, prerogatives, honors, thus showing himself to be proud, self-ignorant, presumptuous. "So we have," writes Dr. J. A. Dorner, in a recent paper in the *Contemporary Review*, "that monstrous compound being composed of self-exaltation and the purest love to God and man—a liar and a sacrilegious criminal, who took on himself to build up a kingdom of God, after having overturned the foundations of the kingdom of God within himself:" a miracle this—"greater and more unnatural than all the miracles in the New Testament."

A criticism which involves itself in such glaring self-contradictions must be false. It is an excellent sign of hope that the unchristian dogmatism of the age is becoming so undisguisedly anti-christian and self-exploding. As a most natural result, the sceptical writers of Europe are fast losing their hold on minds which wish to retain any honesty and self-respect in dealing with the question of the origin of Christianity. This "last word" of the infidel leaders is not the true philosophy of that event. It can not be, as any sensible person must see. All other explanations of it, then, having been tried and abandoned, what remains but to fall back upon the true doctrine of the historic Christ, as given of God to the fathers, and as held by the church universal in all subsequent time?

PAGANISM AGAIN. In an article on "Character," in the last number of the *North American Review*, Mr. Waldo Emerson comes forward with a distinct plea for a return to Paganism as a better guide to salvation than is elsewhere to be found. Arguing that the latent and active forces inhering in individual character are the only reliable renovating power in society, he makes his complimentary bow to "Jesus" as a high type of this—"Jesus has immense claims on the gratitude of mankind"; but immediately takes his disciples to task for an admiration of him which runs away with their respect for the souls of men, and "hampers us with limitations of person and text." That is, instead of simply telling the story of their leader, they presume to weave into this the claims of a mandatory religion, which "inclines the manly reader to lay down the New Testament to take up the Pagan philosophers." Not that these are intrinsically better, only they spare the pride of the "manly reader"; of course, this must be the "chief end" of a true religious system, for is not man as divine as deity itself, is he not God coming into consciousness? These Pagan ethics "do not invade his freedom; because they are only suggestions, whilst the other adds the inadmissible claim of positive authority—of an external command, where command can not be." Oh no! Man and God are joint partners in this firm, according to the Concord gospel, and why should one undertake to "command the other"? Is not the "manly" as godlike as the divine? So, by reason of this churchly excrecence of a direct religious commandment, the New Testament loses "the claim" which is so attractive in "the Pagan moralists," namely, "of suggestion, the claim of poetry, of mere truth." Now the world, thinks Mr. Emerson, needs all the "mere truth" which is in and about it; therefore, the Bible must be freed from its authoritative incumbrances so as to bring it up to the level of the heathen sages: "and the office of this age is to put all these writings on the eternal footing of equality of origin in the instincts of the human mind."

This seems to be the last response of the modern Delphi. Our principal wonder concerning it is, that it should have found utterance through the pages of a Quarterly, which we have supposed was not intended to be an organ of matters pertaining to religion, but rather an exponent of North American literature, in the general and unsectarian meaning of that term. If our venerable contemporary is henceforth to be the propagandist of a revamped Paganism, we have no objections, provided it will issue a new prospectus accordingly. So much of a manifesto of its counter conversion would seem to be demanded even by the morality of a respectable deism.



SPLITTING HAIRS. Gibbon has a characteristic sneer at the Nicene distinction which marked the radical and infinite difference between the Orthodox and the Arians. "The profane of every age have derided the furious contests which the difference of a single diphthong excited between the Homocousians and the Homoiousians." But the change to an iota here robs Christ of his divinity, the world of an atonement and redemption, and Christianity of any valuable peculiarity and vitality. "The difference of a single diphthong" results in the difference between Jonathan Edwards and Theodore Parker, as theologians, and between the evangelical and the liberal system of faith as seen to-day. It was quite a hair to split, and indifferent men, and dull, narrow minds, would naturally deride the struggle over an iota.

It is so yet. The untutored and short sighted make light of great issues because made in small compass. They can not see beyond the narrow strait that Gibraltar covers, or foresee the harvest, shaking like Lebanon, in the handful of corn. They call it a wrangle over words and phrases only, with no real difference. A distinction between depravity of nature and of action is unmeaning and indifferent to them: whether God or man is supposed to make the soul holy, is of little account in their estimation, if only the man be holy.

All delicate, interior, primal distinctions are mere hair-splitting to them, though in these distinctions the student in history and philosophy sees systems *toto cælo* apart.

It has been fashionable, and still is, though decreasingly so since it reflects such discredit on one's acumen or sincerity, to call much theological discussion a mere dispute about words. Not being able to go back to the intricate sources where Calvinism and Arminianism diverge and found themselves separately, they turn from the discussion petulant, or reply to the arguments with a smile and a sneer, as if it were small work for Christian men. It is as if they should laugh at budding the seedlings of a year old, and say that real men would give their strength and grafting to full grown trees.

It may be very reasonable, at least natural, that men accustomed mostly to cleavers and pit-saws, should call all nice work, as in making microscopes and chronometers, hair-splitting. But scholarly and profound men, giving their strength to the vital interests of Christ's church, and seeing her through the ages of a varied experience, will do their noble work by guarding her creed and life against the iotas of heresy and apostasy.